

VOL. XIX. (XXXVIII.)
1880.

[THIRD SERIES.]

NO. LXXIII. (CLXXXVII.)
JANUARY.

THE MONTH

AND

Catholic Review.



LONDON:

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

BURNS AND OATES.

DUBLIN: W. H. SMITH AND SON; M. H. GILL AND SON.

GLASGOW: H. MARGEY. PARIS: A. XAVIER.

BALTIMORE: KELLY AND PIET. NEW YORK: P. O'SHEA.

NEW YORK AND MONTREAL: D. AND J. SADLIER.

Price Half-a-Crown.

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

*TO FOREIGN SUBSCRIBERS TO THE MONTH AND
CATHOLIC REVIEW.*

THE Subscription to *The Month and Catholic Review* for all countries included in the Postal Union is the same as in England and Ireland, *i.e.* 30/- a year *paid in advance*. Foreign Subscribers can receive the numbers at this rate by sending their addresses and subscriptions to the Office, 48, South Street, Grosvenor Square. Cheques to be drawn upon any London Bank, and Money Orders upon the Post Office, London, payable to Mr. JOSEPH HAGUE.

ST. JOSEPH'S
CATHOLIC LENDING LIBRARY,
48, South Street, Grosvenor Square.

OPEN DAILY FROM HALF-PAST TEN TO FIVE O'CLOCK.

T E R M S .

I. For Subscribers who pay in advance:

For a Month.....	1 Vol.	at a time...	<i>Two Shillings.</i>
For One Quarter	3 Vols.	"	<i>Six Shillings.</i>
For Half a Year	1 Vol.	"	<i>Six Shillings.</i>
For Half a Year	3 Vols.	"	<i>Half a Guinea.</i>
For a Year	1 Vol.	"	<i>Half a Guinea.</i>
For a Year	3 Vols.	"	<i>One Guinea.</i>
" In the Country	4 Vols.	"	<i>One Guinea.</i>

II. For Families in the Country and for Book Clubs.

For a Year	25 Vols.	"	<i>Five Guineas.</i>
------------------	----------	---	----------------------

Special arrangements can be made for Book Clubs where recent publications are not required.

III. For Casual Readers who pay in advance:

Threepence—1 Vol. at a time, which may be kept a week.

IV. For all who do not pay in advance:

Sixpence for 1 Vol. at a time, and Postage Expenses incurred in recovering Arrears.

**REGISTERS FOR GOVERNESSES, AND OTHERS
REQUIRING SITUATIONS.**

The Managers of St. Joseph's Library have also for some time opened a Register for Catholic Governesses, and are in constant communication with families seeking the services of such ladies. They also receive the names of servants wanting employment, and keep a list of vacant situations. *No fees whatever are charged, except for postage.*



Quarterly Series.

NOW READY.

THE TRAINING OF THE APOSTLES,

(PART I.)

BEING THE FIFTH VOLUME OF THE "PUBLIC LIFE OF OUR LORD."

By THE REV. H. J. COLERIDGE.

Price 6s. 6d.

CONTENTS.

Chapter	I. Characteristics of our Lord's Teaching after the delivery of the Sermon on the Mount.
"	II. The Miraculous Draught of Fishes.
"	III. The Healing of the Leper.
"	IV. The Healing of the Paralytic.
"	V. The Call of St. Matthew.
"	VI. The Feast at St. Matthew's house.
"	VII. 'Mercy and not sacrifice.'
"	VIII. The Children of the Marriage.
"	IX. New Wine and New Bottles.
"	X. The Miracle at the Probatic Pool.
"	XI. Our Lord and the Chief Priests.
"	XII. The Work of the Father and of the Son.
"	XIII. Unity of the Divine operation.
"	XIV. Resurrection and Judgment.
"	XV. Witnesses to our Lord's Mission.
"	XVI. Causes of our Lord's rejection.
"	XVII. The Disciples in the Cornfields.
"	XVIII. The Man with the Withered Hand.
"	XIX. The Servant of God.
Appendix.	—Sequence of the Miracles. Harmony of the Gospels.

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET & PATERNOSTER ROW.

Quarterly Series.

BIOGRAPHIES.

1. *The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier.* By the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. 2 vols. Third Edition. Price 18s.
 2. *The Life of St. Jane Francis Fremyot de Cbantal.* By Emily Bowles. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s. 6d.
 3. *The Story of St. Stanislaus Kostka.* Edited by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. 3s. 6d.
 4. *The Chronicle of St. Anthony of Padua, "The Eldest Son of St. Francis."* Edited by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. In Four Books. Price 5s. 6d.
 5. *The Life of St. Thomas of Hereford.* By R. Strange, S.J. 6s. 6d.
 6. *The Life of the Blessed John Berchmans.* By the Rev. F. Goldie, S.J. Second Edition. Price 6s.
 7. *The Life of the Blessed Peter Favre, First Companion of St. Ignatius Loyola.* From the Italian of Father Boero. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Price 6s. 6d.
 8. *The Life of Anne Catharine Emmerick.* By Helen Ram. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Price 5s.
 9. *The Life of Doña Luisa de Carvajal.* By Lady Georgiana Fullerton. Price 6s.
 10. *An English Carmelite.* By Father Thomas Hunter, S.J. Price 6s.
 11. *The Life of Mother Margaret Mostyn, Prioress of the Discalced Carmelites of Lierre, Flanders.* Edited from the Manuscripts preserved at Darlington, by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Price 6s.
 12. *A Gracious Life, being the Life of Barbara Acarie (Blessed Mary of the Incarnation), of the Reformed Order of our Blessed Lady of Mount Carmel.* By Mary Bowles. Price 6s.
 13. *The Life of Pope Pius the Seventh.* By M. Allies. Price 6s. 6d.
 14. *The Life of Christopher Columbus.* By Rev. A. G. Knight, S.J. 6s.
 15. *The Life of Henriette d'Osseville (in Religion, Mother Ste. Marie), Foundress of the Institute of the Faithful Virgin.* Edited by J. G. MacLeod, S.J. 5s. 6d.
 16. *Three Catholic Reformers of the Fifteenth Century.* I. St. Vincent Ferrer. II. St. Bernardine of Siena. III. St. John Capistran. By Mary H. Allies. 5s.
- The Life of our Life.* By the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. 2 vols. 15s.
- The Public Life of our Lord Jesus Christ.* 5 vols. By the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. 1. "The Ministry of St. John Baptist." 2. "The Preaching of the Beatitudes." 3. "The Sermon on the Mount." 4. "The Sermon on the Mount" (concluded). 5. "The Training of the Apostles" (Part I.). Price 6s. 6d. each.
- The History of the Sacred Passion.* By Father Luis de la Palma, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Spanish. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Fourth Edition. Price 7s. 6d.
- The Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great.* An Old English Version. Edited by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Price 6s.
- The Christian Reformed in Mind and Manners.* By Benedict Rogacci, S.J. The Translation Edited by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. 7s. 6d.
- The Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions.* From documents hitherto unpublished. By the Rev. Alfred Weld, S.J. Price 7s. 6d.
- The Sufferings of the Church in Brittany during the Great Revolution.* By Edward Healy Thompson. Price 6s. 6d.
- The Prisoners of the Temple; or, Discrowned and Crowned.* By M. O'C. Morris. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Price 4s. 6d.
- Ierne of Armorica: A Tale of the Time of Chlovis.* By J. C. Bateman. Price 6s. 6d.

Just published, in 8vo, price 18s.

THE METAPHYSICS OF THE SCHOOL.

VOLUME I.

BY THOMAS HARPER, S.J.

(To be completed in 5 volumes.)

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.

2 vols. demy 8vo, cloth, price 25s.

PER CRUCEM AD LUCEM.

The Result of a Life.

BY T. W. ALLIES, M.A.

C. KEGAN PAUL AND CO., 1, PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

PREPARATORY SCHOOL FOR YOUNG GENTLEMEN.

ST. STANISLAUS,

43a, HAMPSTEAD HILL GARDENS.

MISS FLON,

A native of England, of French Catholic parentage, educated at the Convent de l'Intérieur de Marie, at Montrouge, Paris, possessing her diplomas from the Hotel de Ville, and for several years engaged in tuition in England, Receives and Educates a few Little Boys, whom she instructs in English, Latin, and French, and prepares for the lower forms of the Catholic public schools in England.

TERMS—FIFTY GUINEAS A YEAR.

Miss FLON is permitted to refer to—

The Lady Superior of the Convent de l'Intérieur de Marie	... Montrouge, Paris.
The Most Honourable the Marchioness of Londonderry	... 25, Upper Brook Street.
Lady Alexander Lennox	... 12, Charles St., Berkeley Sq.
The Lady G. Fullerton	... 21, Chapel Street, Park Lane.
The Honourable Mrs. Stonor	... 78, South Audley Street.
The Rev. Superioress, Convent of La Sainte Union des Sacrés Cœurs,	Highgate Road.
The Very Rev. B. Wilberforce, late Prior St. Dominic's, Haverstock Hill, N.W.	
The Very Rev. Fr. Gordon, late Superior of the Oratory, Brompton.	
The Rev. Fr. Christie, S.J.	... 111, Mount Street.
The Rev. A. D. Purcell,	... St. Mary's Hampstead, N.W.
Dr. H. Guneau de Mussy	... 15, Rue de Cirque, Paris.
Dr. Tebay	... 37, Belgrave Road.
Dr. West	... 61, Wimpole Street.

Holidays at Midsummer, Christmas, and Easter.

The Year is divided into Three Terms, each of which is payable in advance.

The Birkbeck Building Society's Annual Receipts exceed Four Millions.

HOW TO PURCHASE A HOUSE FOR TWO GUINEAS PER MONTH, with Immediate Possession and no Rent to pay.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK BUILDING SOCIETY, 29 and 30, Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane.

HOW TO PURCHASE A PLOT OF LAND FOR FIVE SHILLINGS PER MONTH, with Immediate Possession, either for Building or Gardening purposes.—Apply at the Office, as above.

HOW TO INVEST YOUR MONEY WITH SAFETY.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK BANK, 29 and 30, Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane. Deposits received at varying rates of interest for stated periods, or repayable on demand. Current Accounts opened according to the usual practice of Bankers, and Interest allowed on the minimum monthly balances. English and Foreign Stocks and Shares purchased and sold, and Advances made thereon. Letters of Credit and Circular Notes issued. A Pamphlet, with full particulars, may be had on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

MONTH AND CATHOLIC REVIEW.

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY, 1880.

ARTICLES, &c. :—

1. The Sequence of the Miracles. Part the Second. *By the Rev. H. J. Coleridge.*
2. Lingerings in German Cities (Chapter I. Hanover). *By H. Bedford, Esq.*
3. On the Perception of the Senses. Part the Third—The Act of Sensation. *By the Rev. Richard F. Clarke.*
4. The Adventures of Twelve Catholic Students. Part the Second.
5. Bishop Challoner. *By Thomas Arnold, M.A.*
6. Pope Honorius. *By the Rev. T. B. Parkinson.*
7. A "Pleasant Party at Windsor."
8. "The Metaphysics of the School."

CATHOLIC REVIEW.

I.—Notes on the Press.

- 1.—The present state of the French Church.
- 2.—State of affairs in Belgium.

II.—Reviews.

Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum Collectio Lacensis (Second Notice); The Training of the Apostles (Part I.), by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge; Sunshine and Storm in the East, by Mrs. Brassey; Cyprus, as I saw it in 1879, by Sir Samuel White Baker; Religion and Science, by Maurice Ronayne.

III.—Notices.

Les Philosophes Convertis, par M. Ch. de Bussy; Le Procès de la Reine, par Raoul de Naverly; Meditations and Contemplations on the Sacred Passion and the Blessed Sacrament, by the Ven. Luis of Granada; The workings of the Divine Will, from the French of Père Caussade; St. Joseph's Manual of a Happy Eternity, by Father Sebastian of the Blessed Sacrament, O.P.; Jack's Boy, by the Author of Fluffy; The Countess de Bonneval, her Life and Letters, by Lady Georgiana Fullerton; Miscellaneous.

*** Vol. XVIII. is now ready. Cases for Binding can be had at the Publishers.*

All Advertisements to be sent to MESSRS. BURNS and OATES, 17 Portman Street, W.

JOHN HARDMAN AND COMPANY,

BIRMINGHAM,

Metal Workers in Silver, Brass, and Wrought Iron,

GAS FITTERS,

ENGRAVERS OF MEMORIAL BRASSES,

Artists in Stained Glass and Mural Decorators,

Medallists, &c.

MESSRS. J. HARDMAN AND CO. having lately rebuilt their Show Rooms in London, and made considerable improvements and additions to them, have now a much larger stock of Art Metal Work on view, of which they respectfully invite an inspection from Architects and all who are interested in Ecclesiastical Art.

LONDON ADDRESS:

13, KING WILLIAM STREET, STRAND, W.C.

AGENTS:

BURNS AND OATES, 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

The Sequence of the Miracles.

PART THE SECOND.

THE confession of St. Peter, the beginning of the preaching of the Cross, and the great mystery of the Transfiguration which followed at a short interval, mark a great change in the manner of our Lord's acting, and also, as it seems, were followed, after no great lapse of time, by a change in the ordinary scene of His preaching. For it was soon after this that our Lord no longer preached in Galilee. He went up to Jerusalem for the feast of Tabernacles in the autumn of the year which immediately preceded His Passion, and during the months which followed the chief scene of His Ministry would appear to have been Judæa itself, with occasional visits to Jerusalem. He also spent a part of this time in Peræa, the country beyond the Jordan, and was at one time, at all events, on the confines of Galilee, though we have no certain intimation that He passed any time there. During this most important period, we have comparatively but few miracles specially recorded, but these which are so recorded are remarkably interesting to us in our present inquiry. It has been already said, that a reason may be assigned for the absence of any mention of large numbers of miracles together. Our information as to this time comes almost exclusively from St. Luke and St. John, with the exception of the time spent in Peræa, which country was the place in which our Lord delivered some of His most important teaching, especially with relation to what we call the counsels of perfection and such matters as the law of marriage and divorce. This teaching is recorded by the two earlier Evangelists, as well as by St. Luke. But, as to the period before that teaching, the purpose of St. Luke, who is the historian of the Judæan preaching of our Lord, as distinguished from the Galilæan preaching, and of St. John, who has filled up the blank left by the former Evangelists as to the scenes in Jerusalem itself, is mainly didactic and doctrinal, and this fact supplies

us with the reason for their comparative silence as to the miracles of our Lord in general, while it also gives the explanation of their mention of those miracles which they do insert. These, it will be seen, are mentioned by them precisely on account of their bearing on the course of the events of our Lord's life. This will be quite enough to enable us to see the importance of these miracles on the onward march of the Church history.

There are in all only five great miracles specially recorded by these two Evangelists, before the point at which the three first Gospels again, so to say, meet, at the last journey of our Lord to Jerusalem before the last pasch, at which He was to suffer. Of these five miracles, three are related by St. Luke and two by St. John. The two which St. John records are evidently most important in their bearing on the history. These two miracles are the healing of the man who had been blind from his birth, and the raising of Lazarus from the dead.¹ The first of these took place at Jerusalem itself, and the other at Bethany, close to Jerusalem. The first, the miracle on the man born blind, was wrought, like the miracle on the man at the pool, on the Sabbath Day. It led to a fresh outburst of the hatred which the chief priests had now conceived against our Lord, and also to the first instance of which we have any record of the passing of the sentence of excommunication on any one who professed his belief in Him. The fear of this sentence of excommunication is mentioned by St. John as the reason why some of the principal men among the rulers themselves did not avow themselves believers in our Lord.² And it appears from the history of the early Church that this was one of the great causes of the poverty of the Christian community at Jerusalem, who were excluded, by being treated as excommunicate, from all share in the abundant alms which were sent from all parts of the world to the Holy City. That the sentence of excommunication from the Jewish synagogue was felt as a terrible disgrace, even by Christian Jews for many years after, seems to be implied by St. Paul's language to the Hebrews in a time of persecution, "We have an altar," he says, "whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the Holies by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people by His

¹ St. John ix. xi.

² St. John xii. 42.

own Blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth, therefore, to Him without the camp, bearing His reproach."³ This is enough to explain the importance of this miracle on the man blind from his birth, which is also one of the greatest of the miracles in itself, and which led to a very long discussion between our Lord and the Jewish rulers, for which alone it is very probable that St. John would have selected it for special mention. It is unnecessary to say anything about the great importance of the miracle of the raising of Lazarus. More than any other single action of our Lord, this miracle brought about the determination of the Jews to put Him to death, and it was immediately after this that Caiaphas gave his famous counsel that one man must die for the nation.⁴ And it is also important on another account, because it is connected with the incident of the supper at Bethany, which determined the traitor Judas to take his step of treachery at once. And this miracle mainly produced the enthusiasm of the people who came out to meet our Lord on Palm Sunday, which, again, confirmed the resolution of Caiaphas and his compeers to bring about our Lord's death as soon as possible.⁵ It is therefore clear, without further discussion, that the miracles which are chosen by St. John for insertion in his narrative at this point, have each of them a very marked importance in their bearing on the unfolding of the Divine plan by which His life was ordered.

If we turn now to the miracles which St. Luke records in this period, between the Transfiguration and the ascent of our Lord for the last time to Jerusalem, we are struck with a fact which seems at first sight somewhat strange and which must give some trouble to harmonists till they have mastered the right principle of understanding the purpose of the third Evangelist. For St. Luke, in his narrative of this time, relates exclusively miracles which are parallel to others which occur at an earlier period in the histories of St. Mark and St. Matthew. These miracles are four in number. Two of them are Sabbatical miracles, in the sense of the name already explained, that is, they were miracles wrought in public on the Sabbath Day, when our Lord was aware of the hostile criticism to which such acts of His would be exposed and when—as it seems fair to conclude—He purposely braved that hostility, for the sake of asserting the principle of the right meaning of the law of the Sabbath and of His own authority as the Son of Man, Lord also

³ Heb. xiii. 10—13.

⁴ St. John xi. 50.

⁵ St. John xii. 17—19.

of the Sabbath Day. These two miracles are those mentioned by St. Luke in the thirteenth chapter, the cure of the woman, whom our Lord spoke of as a daughter of Abraham, who had had a spirit of infirmity for eighteen years, and that on the dropsical man, mentioned in the fourteenth chapter. In both these cases, our Lord acted as He had done in the earlier part of His Ministry in Galilee, and healed these poor sufferers in spite of the opposition which would be aroused by the miracle. The other two miracles of St. Luke in this part are also repetitions of miracles which had been before worked. One of these is exactly parallel to the miracle already spoken of as having given occasion to the atrocious calumny of the Pharisees, who imputed the cure, which they could not question, to a league with Beelzebub. This is the miracle related by St. Luke in his eleventh chapter. It differs from the miracle in St. Matthew,⁶ in that the demoniac out of whom the devil is cast, in the account of the earlier Evangelist is blind as well as dumb, and that in St. Luke only dumb. The effect of the dispossession is the same in each case—that is, the sufferer regains the use of the sense or senses of which he had been deprived. And the effect on the enemies of our Lord is the same in each case—that is, the miracle is mentioned, as it would seem, for the purpose of informing us of the black calumny to which it gave occasion on the part of the Pharisees. Our Lord answers this calumny in much the same way in both passages. The other miracle of this time in St. Luke is the healing of the ten lepers, which is analogous to the first miracle of the same kind of which we have already spoken, as occurring quite at the beginning of a chain of works of wonder, which were designed to set forth the prerogatives of the Son of Man in His Kingdom.

Thus we have St. Luke, as it were, repeating the same notes as to the Ministry of our Lord in Judæa, which had already been struck with regard to the earlier Ministry in Galilee by the first two Evangelists. It has sometimes been a trouble to commentators, how to explain the apparent divergence between the narratives of miracles so much alike to one another as these in St. Luke on the one hand and those in St. Matthew on the other, not to speak of the other difficulty as to the point of the history in which they are respectively placed. But the truth seems to be, that the miracles of this class were, in themselves

⁶ St. Matt. xii. 22—24.

and in their consequences, highly important in the effect which they produced on the rulers of the Jews. Before the incident of the raising of Lazarus, the chief occasions which had roused these rulers against Him had been just these—His healing on the Sabbath Day, and His casting our devils from persons who were not simply demoniacs, but also afflicted by the privation of the use of some of their natural organs of sense. The simplest account of the anger which these last miracles provoked in the Pharisees, seems to lie in the fact that exorcisms were practised by themselves as a sort of ecclesiastical function, but that they could never attain to the cures which accompanied the deliverances worked by our Lord. This was something beyond the ordinary effect of exorcisms, as the Jews knew of them. The stages of the hostility to our Lord on the part of the Pharisees were marked in the first place, by the healing on the Sabbath, and in the second place by the instances of these dispossessions which were also cures. It may be thought also that the healing of the lepers, had also some effect on their jealous and envious minds—inasmuch as the leprosy was a disease altogether different from others, humanly and ordinarily incurable, the recovery from which was reserved to the priests for examination and for certification.

It is well known to students of the Gospel Harmony, that there is very good reason for believing that the long series of incidents which are related by St. Luke and, apparently, by him alone, and which fill up so large a portion of his whole Gospel—from the ninth to the eighteenth chapter—took place in Judæa, that is in the country about Jerusalem to the south-west of the Holy Land, and not in Galilee. This appears to be St. Luke's chief independent contribution to the history of our Lord, after his invaluable additions at the beginning of the whole. We shall assume this to be so, having elsewhere gone into the question at considerable length.⁶ But if this is so, it is easy to understand why, if there were certain prominent historical features in the preaching of our Lord, especially as to the attitude of His enemies and the effect on His line of conduct which that attitude produced, and if these same features reappeared, as they were certain to reappear, in the course of His second period of popular preaching in the country parts of Judæa, as they had before appeared in His Galilæan preaching, the Evangelist to whom the narrative of that second

⁶ See *Life of our Life*, vol. i. Introduction p. iv; vol. ii. ch. 2.

period fell should have selected miracles which held the same prominence in their effects in this portion of the story as other miracles of the same sort held in the story of the Galilæan preaching. Thus, if it be true that the attitude of the Jewish rulers towards our Lord was determined in Galilee by His miracles on the leper, on the Sabbath Day, and on the possessed persons who were also blind or deaf or dumb as the consequence of their possession by Satan, or at least at the same time with that possession, it is shown by St. Luke to be equally true that the attitude of our Lord's enemies in Judæa was determined by incidents exactly similar to these. This is of itself a decided and most valuable addition to our knowledge of the history as a whole. It has already been said that St. Luke does not pause in this portion of his story to relate many miracles, but it is surely significant that he should have been guided in his selection of a few by the principle of which we speak.

After this cycle, so to call it, of miracles of the later period of our Lord's teaching, we have but few that remain of which we have any special account. These are, in the first place, the double miracle at Jericho on the blind men, then the few cures which are mentioned as having been wrought by our Lord on His entrance into the Temple on Palm Sunday, then the cursing of the barren fig-tree. These exhaust the list of miracles mentioned in the Gospels before the Passion. There remains the miracle on Malchus, wrought in the Garden of Olives at the very time of our Lord's capture by His enemies, and, after the Resurrection, we have one conspicuous miracle, the second miraculous fishing in the Lake of Galilee.⁷ It is not difficult to justify, in regard to these miracles, the statement which has been already generally made, and on which the whole of this essay depends, that is, that the miracles which are specially mentioned by the Evangelists, are so specially mentioned for the sake of some particular relation which they bear to the development of the plan of our Lord's Public Life, except in a few cases when the Evangelists having from other reasons to relate the circumstances which led to them or with which they were historically connected, would naturally not omit them. We may assign this reason for the mention of the miracles at Jericho. That was a very memorable entrance and exit from Jericho, and it was natural that the miracles which then occurred should not be omitted, though indeed, it

⁷ St. John xxi. 6.

may very fairly be said that the two miracles taken together constitute a picture of our Lord's ineffable condescension and pity for suffering such as is hardly to be found elsewhere in the history. The same reason may be given for the mention of the healing of a few sick persons in the Temple on Palm Sunday, while the miracle of the cursing of the fig-tree is a parable in action, and could not possibly have taken place at any other point of our Lord's history so well as at the particular moment at which it was wrought. It is also clear that the healing of Malchus is a work of a very different order from any ordinary miracle by which the same effect might have been produced, and that the miracle of the second miraculous fishing is also full of prophetic and even sacramental meaning, and is to be taken, as all the miracles mentioned by St. John are to be taken, in connection with the discourse which followed, in which, in this case, our Lord conferred on St. Peter the supreme pastorate in the Church.

Having thus run through, however rapidly, the whole series of these specially recorded miracles of our Lord, we are able to see their relation to at least two very important features in His history, on which it is clear that the whole course of that history mainly depended. One of these is the effect which His course of teaching and of miracles had on His enemies, and the other is the connection of certain miracles with some of the greatest doctrines and principles of His Church. It is clear enough that if our Lord had worked no miracles, the rulers at Jerusalem would probably have left Him alone. If His work had been confined to the promulgation of certain new truths and even to the assertion of certain new claims, Annas and Caiaphas might have afforded to let His movement work itself out, as they had passed, almost unnoticed, the movement of St. John Baptist. There were no doubt points in His teaching which they might have felt as attacks on themselves, or on the traditions which they were so careful to preserve. But that which gave His teaching force was that it was accompanied by displays of Divine power. It was this that gave Him His position in the minds of the people, and this position in the minds of the people forced the rulers of the people to deal with Him as they did. It made it necessary for them, either to acknowledge His claims, or to destroy Him in whatever way they could. For this reason a certain account of some of His miracles is essential in any true estimate of the history. It is

mere childishness to suppose that the rulers would not have denied the miracles if they could. As it was they were driven by them to use two arguments against Him, one of which was captious and pharisaical, and the other diabolical. The first was that whatever might be the true explanation of His power, His miracles could not be the evidences of a truly Divine mission, because He wrought them on the Sabbath Day and thus violated the law. The other was, that the power which He showed over the devils was conceded to Him, not by God, but by virtue of a league with Satan himself, for the sake of imposing a false doctrine on the people. The first naturally preceded the other, the second grew out of the first. It has been already sufficiently pointed out how this accounts for the prominence given by the historical Evangelists to the "Sabbatical" miracles, and to the instances in which the enemies of our Lord were forced to bring up the explanation founded on the supposed league with Satan, those instances, namely, in which, the devils having been cast out, the dumb spake or the blind saw.

These miracles, therefore, are in the strictest sense historical. They belong to the very foundations of the history of the three years of the Public Life. But there are also others which belong to that history in another way, namely, as having been connected with incidents and features which had a prominence of their own in the general history of our Lord. To this class we may assign the two instances of the cleansing of the Temple, considered as exertions of preternatural power. To the same class belong the clusters of miracles which occurred at the outset and at the close of our Lord's Ministry at Capharnaum. In the same list we may place the miracle on the lunatic boy which occurred when our Lord and His three disciples came down from the mountain on which the Transfiguration had taken place. The same may be said of the miracle on the blind men at Jericho, and of the few cures wrought by our Lord in the Temple on the evening, as it seems, of Palm Sunday. And lastly, the miracle of the healing of Malchus belongs naturally to any complete account of the Passion. It may be that none of these miracles had any special relation to the development of the Jewish opposition to our Lord, or on the onward flow of His Life as it had been ordained by the providence of the Father—that they asserted no new claim, and taught no new doctrine. But the outlines of the history being

what they are, it would have been unnatural that such incidents as these, belonging to particular times and occasions, should have been omitted. We may say the same of the few miracles, mentioned because it might have been expected that they would have been far more numerous, which our Lord was able, as St. Mark puts it, to work at Nazareth on the occasion of His last visit to that place.

Besides these miracles, which may be called in various senses historical, it is clear that there are a certain number which are deeply significative, and even, in a certain sense, sacramental in their import. The great sacramental miracles are the miracle at Cana of the turning the water into wine, the miracle on the paralytic man, wrought in direct proof of our Lord's claim to have power on earth to forgive sins, and the double miracle of the multiplication of the loaves, for the feeding of the five thousand and the four thousand. Nearly in the same class we may place the miracles which are doctrinal in the sense that they teach great principles of our Lord's Kingdom, such as those on the servant of the Gentile centurion, and on the daughter of the Syrophenician woman. In the same way the miracles wrought on the Sabbath Day have a second kind of importance, inasmuch as they teach our Lord's doctrine as to the observance of the commandment which enjoined the keeping of the Sabbath. And we may place in the same class the two miracles of the healing of the lepers, which certainly have a significance in their relation to the Christian doctrine of the absolution of sin.

Another class of miracles are those which may be considered as prophetical, or, at least, symbolical, of the powers or the fortunes of the Church. The miracles on the Lake of Galilee form a beautiful chain in this respect. They begin with the first miraculous fishing, a miracle altogether unsolicited, and, like the miracle at Cana, not strictly called for by the necessities of the moment, or, at least, going very far beyond them. Then comes the miracle of the stilling the tempest while our Lord was asleep in the boat. It is hardly possible for devout minds to contemplate this miracle, and not to see in it a promise and a prophecy of the fortunes of the Christian Church. Then follows the miracle of our Lord's walking on the waters, and calling St. Peter to Him to do the same, and the miracle of the didrachma, found in the mouth of the fish taken by St. Peter out of the lake, has the same sort of signification. Lastly, the whole series of miracles closes with the second unsolicited

miraculous draught of fishes, in which again St. Peter plays a prominent part, and which introduces the great discourse in which the whole flock of Christ is committed to his charge. There is also another miracle, not on the lake, which may be classed among the prophetic miracles. This is that of the cursing of the barren fig-tree, which is clearly, as has been said, a parable in action, and which must be considered in connection with our Lord's saying about the fig-tree which had been found unfruitful for three years,⁸ and was spared for one year more at the intercession of the gardener. We may also consider that the words about the blossoming of the fig-tree as a sign of the end of the world,⁹ which are usually understood of the conversion of the Jews, may have reference to this figure also. That is, the fig-tree which is cursed, and which is sentenced to perpetual barrenness, is the synagogue, and thus our Lord's action in this miracle is equivalent to a solemn sentence of reprobation pronounced by Him on it, which sentence will be removed at the end of the world by the conversion of the Jews.

The importance of the miracles which we have classified as historical and doctrinal, or prophetic and symbolical, may be confirmed by the consideration how great a number of them were unsolicited by those for whose benefit they were wrought. We may suppose that on those occasions when our Lord is spoken of by the Evangelists as working a great multitude of miracles at once, as must have been the case in the ordinary course of His Ministry in Galilee and in Judæa, the miracles which were thus wrought were solicited by the people, who often, as we are told, brought their sick, even from a distance, to Him for the sake of the healing which they hoped to obtain from His mercifulness. In such cases the mere presentation to Him of a number of such sufferers was a plain and open appeal to His mercy, as well as a protestation of faith in His power. In a great many other instances, no doubt He was asked to do this or that miraculous cure. But in a great number out of the miracles of which we have a special account in the Gospels, our Lord Himself took the initiative. It is but reasonable to suppose that He had in such cases a design beyond and above the healing of the particular physical malady before His eyes. It is natural to look to such miracles for the development of the revelation concerning Himself which He had to make, for

⁸ St. Luke xiii. 6—9.

⁹ St. Matthew xxiv. 32, 33; St. Mark xiii. 28, 29; St. Luke xxi. 29, 30.

the illustration of some doctrine or principle of His Church. Now, if we go through the list of the unsolicited miracles, we find that they include those of which we have been speaking in this connection. The miracle of Cana itself, the first of all, was not thought of by the bridegroom and bride for whose relief it was ostensibly worked. It was thought of and asked for by our Blessed Lady, but not by them, nor was it worked, as we may say, for them, but for the manifestation of the glory of the Incarnate Son of God to His few disciples. In the same way all the Sabbatical miracles—not all those that were worked on the Sabbath, but all those which were worked on the Sabbath with a special view to the doctrine connected therewith, and with the power of the Son of Man as Lord of the Sabbath,—were unsolicited. But these are very considerable in number and in magnitude. They include the miracle at the Pool of Bethesda, and that, at a later period, on the man who was blind from his birth. Both these were wrought in Jerusalem. The miracle on the man with the withered hand seems to have been wrought in Galilee, and there are, besides, two of these Sabbatical miracles mentioned by St. Luke, as has been seen, the case of a woman with a spirit of infirmity, and of the dropsical man. Both these seem to have occurred in the country part of Judæa itself, and both were unsolicited.

The same is to be said of the miracles of the multiplication of the loaves—they were altogether unexpected by the Apostles, and unasked for by the multitude themselves, except in the way in which the simple sight of their need was enough to move the tender Heart of our Lord in their favour. The same, again, is to be said of the miracles on the lake, except the stilling of the storm, in which case the terror and danger of the disciples made them have recourse to our Lord, without, perhaps, any perfect anticipation of the manner in which He would extricate them from the difficulty. That is to say, both the miraculous fishings and the miracle of the walking on the waters were altogether due to our Lord's own choice and design. Again, as to the miracles of restoration of life, there is something of the same kind. The miracle of the widow's son was not thought of by the mourners or by the mother of the young man. Jairus, the father of the girl at Capharnaum, had set out from his house while she was yet alive, and was led on by our Lord's healing of the woman with an issue of blood to a higher faith than that with which he had begun, like the ruler, whose son

was healed at a distance, and the sisters of Lazarus had to be carefully questioned, and by questioning instructed, by our Lord, before He wrought the last great miracle of this kind. If the cleansing of the Temple be numbered among the miracles, that also was unsolicited on both the occasions on which it took place; so was the healing of Malchus; so were the miracle of the didrachma, the miracle on the fig-tree, the casting out of the legion of devils, while the multitude of miracles that were wrought in the presence of the envoys of St. John Baptist, may well be considered as having been wrought for their benefit, as well as for that of the sufferers who were then delivered from various maladies, and even the miracle of the widow's son seems to have been worked, as has been already said, in order to prepare the answer which was to be made to the envoys of the Baptist on that occasion. Besides these miracles, which came forth spontaneously, as it were, from the Heart of our Lord, when He was not expected to work them, there are others in which His own Divine counsel influenced the manner in, or the conditions on, which they were vouchsafed, as in the case of the ruler's son, the paralytic who was let down in his bed before our Lord, and the woman with the issue of blood. In the case of the demoniacs, as of the man who was dispossessed in the synagogue at Capharnaum, and that of the legion of devils, it seems to have been sometimes the case that the taunting and mocking or terrified cries of the devils, "Art Thou come to torment us before the time?" and the like, furnished our Lord with the motive, we might almost say the provocation, on which He acted in working the miracle. He could not suffer such language from the enemies of God and man.

It is thus clear that the miracles which we have ventured to single out from among the rest, as having some special bearing on the unfolding of the counsels of God in the history of the Incarnation, may very likely have been selected by the Evangelists, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, on account of that special bearing. It will be some confirmation of the general view thus taken of the miracles, if we find that it is borne out by the use made of them in the several Divine books of which we have been speaking. But it is remarkable that all three of the historical Evangelists agree in inserting some of the Sabbatical miracles as well as in mentioning the miracles which occasioned the calumny about the league with Beelzebub. It is true that St. Luke seems to choose, as is always his method,

different instances of miracles of these classes, as if to show us that the preaching of our Lord was exposed to the same phase of opposition in Judæa as in Galilee. It may be thought that in doing this, the third Evangelist to some extent impairs the exact order of time in the development of that opposition, because the occasions on which he mentions these Sabbatical miracles, and the calumny occasioned by the deliverance of the dumb demoniac, are to be placed, like all that occurs in that part of his narrative, at a later point in the general history than that at which the similar incidents in St. Matthew and St. Mark had occurred. It was, indeed, before our Lord transferred the scene of His general preaching from Galilee to Judæa, that the persecution on account of His miracles on the Sabbath Day had taken form, and that the calumny as to Beelzebub had been invented. But St. Luke is not writing a chronological history of the course taken by the adversaries of our Lord, and it is enough for him to show that their course towards our Lord was the same in Judæa that it had been in Galilee, or, rather, to give a general account of that course as prompted by the motives which actually did prompt it. Moreover, St. Luke fixes the outbreak of that persecution with great precision, mentioning the Sabbath in particular on which the remarks on the disciples eating in the corn-fields were made by the Pharisees, and thus he has, in truth, done more than the others towards making the point of time precise at which this line of opposition was taken up. In the same way, all the three Evangelists who are in the more strict sense historians, mention the healing of the leper and the miracle on the paralytic, as well as the great sacramental miracle of the multiplication of the loaves. Thus the reason why such miracles are selected by all the three earlier Evangelists may well be supposed to be their importance in the history itself.

If we turn to St. John, we must remember that he does not profess to do more towards the work of an independent historian than is implied in the supplementary character of his Gospel, considered as a narrative. And yet we find him bearing remarkable testimony to the importance of the points on which we have been insisting, as marking what may be called crises in the Public Life. His fifth chapter is invaluable in this respect. In that chapter he seems to explain silently, that is, without open allusion to it, the hostility of the Chief Priests to our Lord on the question of the Sabbath. He seems to tell us

that it did not begin from the chance incident of the plucking the ears of corn in the fields on the Sabbath Day, but that before that, and, as it seems, only just before that, our Lord had worked the first of His Sabbatical miracles on the man at the Pool of Bethesda, not only this, but that He had held a long disputation on the subject with the authorities themselves, in which He had taken far higher ground than any which He took in the discussions with His critics on the same point in Galilee. That is, He had spoken of the unity of His work with the work of the Eternal Father, making Himself, as the scribes themselves perceived and said, "equal with God." This is St. John's contribution to this part of the Gospel history. He lays it down quite clearly, that it was on this account that our Lord's Life was in danger in Judæa. Thus even the fourth Gospel is not without its witness—a point of detail more important than any which had been contributed before—to the truth as to this feature in the opposition to our Lord. But it may safely be said that this was the most important turning-point in the whole history. The charge which was based on an imputation of a league with Satan, was far less probable than the charge about the Sabbath. And indeed, it seems to have sprung out of the other. We find no special mention of this in the Gospel of St. John, unless it be conveyed in the words of the Jews mentioned in the eighth chapter, "Say we not well that Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?" On the other points which have been mentioned in reference to the prominent importance of certain miracles of our Lord, St. John is practically as plain as the other Evangelists. It is his peculiar work to draw out the policy pursued with regard to our Lord by the rulers at Jerusalem, and the latter half of that portion of his Gospel which precedes the account of the Last Supper and the Passion is infinitely valuable on this account. He alone mentions the strong hostility caused by the miracle on the man born blind, and he alone mentions the excommunication which was inflicted on the person cured by this miracle, a sentence the fear of which, as he tells us, kept back many of the principal men themselves from avowing their faith in our Lord. Lastly, St. John is the historian of the great crowning miracle of the raising of Lazarus, which, as has been said, had, more than any other miracle, to do with the final determination of Caiphas and his colleagues to bring about the murder of our Lord.

In the same way it is clear, that all the Evangelists recognize

the importance of the sacramental miracles. We may account for the silence of the first three as to the miracle of Cana, by remembering that they do not begin their history of our Lord's Ministry until the outset of His Galilæan preaching. The whole space of time covered by the first four chapters of St. John is outside the plan of their Gospels. But they mention with all due prominence the miracle on the paralytic, which has so close a connection with the doctrine of the Sacrament of Penance, and they also give great prominence to the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves, though the long discourse by which our Lord fixed for ever the sacramental meaning of that miracle is left to St. John.

It must be remembered that the scope of this essay is not to deny, or in any way to impair, the value and importance of the miracles of our Lord as evidences. When He enumerated, in His discourse reported in the fifth chapter of the Gospel of St. John, the various kinds of evidences by which His mission had been accredited by the Providence of His Father, He placed the testimony of His works, that is, of His miracles, higher even than the witness borne to Him by St. John Baptist. It would be absurd to suppose that the Evangelists had not the evidential value of the miracles in view when they recorded them. But it is useful to remind ourselves that the miracles, and especially the recorded miracles, have a meaning and a bearing in relation to the Person and work of our Lord which are in many cases independent of their importance as simple evidences that God was with Him. St. Matthew has given us a beautiful instance of the manner in which they can be combined in a chain of such evidences, in the passage of his Gospel which follows immediately on the Sermon on the Mount. After that Sermon, of which he is the providential reporter for the Church of all ages, he proceeds to give us in succession, almost as if they had actually occurred one after the other, the miracles on the leper, on the centurion's servant, on the mother-in-law of St. Peter, and those that were wrought at Capharnaum on the evening of the same day, before our Lord left it to commence His first great missionary circuit. Then, after an interval of a few verses, he begins again with the miracle of the stilling the tempest, the deliverance of the man who was possessed by a legion of devils, the healing of the paralytic, which was the preface, as it were, to his own call to the Apostolate, the raising from the dead of the daughter of Jairus, the healing of the woman with an issue.

of blood, and the other miracles which took place at Capharnaum on the same occasion. It is clear that St. Matthew must have known, by personal knowledge, if any one in the world could know, that all these miracles did not take place at the same time, nor in the order in which he has placed them in his Gospel. But he uses them for a purpose in his own mind, in accordance with the main idea of that Gospel, and thus presents them to us, as it seems, in evidence of our Lord's exercise of Divine power in every conceivable manner, on the leprosy, on the disease of the servant who was cured at a distance in reward of the faith of his heathen master, then on all kinds of different diseases at once, then on the elements themselves and on the devils, and so on through the whole of this marvellous chain, including His power over death itself in the case of the daughter of Jairus. It would be absurd to deny this intention in St. Matthew, or the evident intention of St. Mark all through the second Gospel, to magnify our Lord by the chronicling of His works of power one after the other.

These facts are clear on a simple inspection of these two first Gospels. But it is also clear that both these Evangelists, and St. Luke also, had a very definite consciousness of the Divine purposes for which some of the miracles were wrought in respect of the course of the Life of our Lord, the doctrines He wished especially to enforce, and the laws of the Kingdom which He came to found on earth. One of the best evidences of the truth of this statement as to the Evangelists, would be found in the simple perusal of the Gospel of St. Mark, with this thought in the mind, of tracing therein the order of the miracles in their connection with the development of the external aspect of our Lord's life, that is, of His relations with the authorities, the people, and His own disciples in particular, and again in their connection with the doctrines which it was important for Him to enforce, and the principles of His Kingdom which He wished to foreshadow. The Gospel of St. Mark is the simplest of all the Gospels in construction. It may be considered as the most elementary expression of the idea of a Gospel as such. It does not follow that it was the earliest of the Gospels in actual existence, for it may well have been the case that the circumstances of the Church or Churches for which it was primarily written may have presented reasons why it is so elementary, though those Churches may only have required it at a time in the actual history of Christianity posterior in

date to the full development of other Churches elsewhere, for which a more elaborate treatment of the subject-matter, such as we have in the Gospel of St. Matthew, may have been more opportune. This question need not be discussed at present. But if any one will take up the Gospel of St. Mark in the manner, and with the general view we have mentioned, he will find that the main outlines of the plan on which we have been supposing that the miracles which have been specially recorded by the Evangelists, were selected, will be easily traced in the book he holds in his hand. He will find the historical miracles, the miracles of doctrine, and the miracles which seem to indicate principles of the Gospel Kingdom, making up by far the greater part of the first ten chapters—that is, the whole of this Gospel until the beginning of the narrative of the events leading to the Passion—in what might seem at first sight almost an enumeration of one wonderful work after another, with but few interruptions for the sake of the insertion of some of the parables and other important heads of teaching. That is, St. Mark tells the story of the three years of our Lord's preaching almost entirely by a series of miracles, and these miracles are, in the main, those which have the particular character of which we have been speaking. The same are found, in principle, in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, though the latter makes it a rule to give fresh specimens of the same kind when he can, instead of the same specimens. The inference is not unnatural that the principles, so to speak, of the Gospel history, are to a great extent contained in these miracles, the purpose for which they were wrought, the doctrines with which they were connected, and the results which they produced.

HENRY J. COLERIDGE.

Lingerings in German Cities.

CHAPTER I.

HANOVER.

WHEN we laid down our pen last spring upon the completion of our "Long Day in Norway," and turned our thoughts towards the vacation which was already looming in the distance, the annual question naturally presented itself—Where shall we go next?

Norway put in its claim first; for it seems quite a well understood thing in the order of travelling, that he who has made acquaintance with that strangely fascinating land, visits it at least once more. And so Norway urged its claim, and Russia rose up behind, as it were, to back its plea, and we lingered for awhile over the double invitation, and remembered that Moscow held out a special attraction in the shape of an anthropological congress and exhibition.

But then we called to mind what the newspapers had been recording, or rather hinting at—as though even at this distance it was not safe to speak except with "bated breath"—as a kind of siege under which St. Petersburg was suffering; and a dim vision rose before our "mind's eye" of the long line of special guardians of the peace ranged along the broad streets, sentinel-ing every door, and ready to capture alike the scared inhabitant who wished to venture out, and the unhappy wanderer who wished to enter in. And so we closed our eyes to Russia, and with it to Norway, and resolved to look at home. At home meant, of course, England: and then Cornwall and the Devons suggested themselves as being close at hand to our land of exile and within easy reach by Irish steamers. In this pleasant thought we rested until the time came for active measures. The summer came—or at least what did duty very imperfectly in 1879 for that bright sunny season—and the easy reach from Dublin to Cornwall seemed anything but easy in the wet cold

storms which were continually raging ; so we naturally faltered in our resolution—if not in our end, at least in our means—and set out for London as the point of our ultimate departure. And so indeed it proved to be, though in quite a different direction from what we then imagined.

Wet, cold, and gloomy was July in London ; bad enough in all conscience for passing visitors, but still preferable to any country spot, and especially to the wild coast we had destined for our summer rambles. Thus it was that London became our first place of lingering ; and attractions of course it ever has in summer which wind, rain, and cold could not destroy.

But our good-natured readers are not to have their good-nature tried too severely, by our dwelling upon what must be familiar to so many of them. So we content ourselves with a passing word on the great lion—or rather, the little lioness—of the season, the tragic actress of the day—Sarah Bernhardt.

Our sides ache as we recall the physical torture we underwent in forcing our way, after two hours' waiting at the door in a back street, up a dirty narrow staircase to the uppermost regions of the Gaiety Theatre. It was our only chance of getting in and seeing Victor Hugo's great play, *Hernani*. Tickets for more dignified places were not to be had ; so up we went in a squeeze which required no ordinary acting for compensation. When we say that we were compensated, and that we would expose our venerable limbs to an equal crush for another performance by Sarah Bernhardt, we have given no slight token of our admiration for that wonderful actress ; for wonderful indeed we consider her to be. A figure slight almost to leanness, a face of no surpassing beauty, a voice of limited power, which is apt to fail when urged too far by the soul within—there is nothing to win the spectator at first sight, and much indeed to surprise, if not to disappoint him. But wait awhile : the voice grows wonderfully musical, the face lightens up with intelligence, and the fragile form has a motion which tells, panther-like, of a suppressed power, all the more impressive for its unexpected development.

Scene succeeded scene of increasing interest, beauty, and power ; and through all the slight form was the chief figure, the delicate voice the ruling influence. Others played their parts with that skill and polish which leave little but great genius to be desired, but Doña Sol was all in all ; the one ruling influence which rose above the rest with a grasp of conception and a

power of realization which marked her as a being of a superior order.

Few who have witnessed will forget the terrible last scene—surprise, rage, horror, rapidly succeeding each other, and all ending in a self-sacrificing love which throws a glow of exquisite beauty over what would otherwise be almost intolerable. It is natural to form our estimate of Sarah Bernhardt by comparing her with other great actresses. This is not quite fair, because we remember them only in their perfection, when all their powers were matured; and, moreover, memory, like moonlight, throws a charm around scenes of the past, while present observation, like bright day, brings out defects which are unnoted in the milder light. But if comparison will not always assist us in estimating an actress aright, it helps at least to indicate the characteristics we would mark, and which individualize the person. So we may say that Sarah Bernhardt is an immature Rachel. She belongs to the class of impulsive characters which reckons Pauline Lucca and Sophie Cruvelli among its chiefs. Madame Ristori is altogether of another order. Edmund Kean was our chief actor of this school. There is a power they possess which suddenly moves us deeply; they strike a cord within us as with an electric shock, and they rule us in spite of ourselves. We talk of flashes of genius, and such indeed they are; as fierce, it may be, as lightning, but as beautiful; they overpower, they dazzle, at times they scorch us. But if it is terrible, is it not also sublime? Yet is there a surpassing tenderness at times which is as powerful to move us as these fierce flashes: and herein lies the chief power of this young actress, and herein the sweet music of her exquisite voice works such wonders.

There is little danger of such an actress being spoiled by fashion. There is too much originality, too much self-reliance, to allow her to lean upon such a frail support. There may be, there almost must be, eccentricity, and some morbid taste in such a nature; but there is an innate vigour which with time will throw off these youthful weaknesses, and then, when the physical power is sufficiently developed that body and voice may respond to the requirements of mind, we may hope to see one worthily claiming sisterhood with the great Rachel herself.

At last the severe season relents, the sun shines once more, and every one prepares to rush out of London. We cling for a few days more to our dream of Cornwall, and arm ourselves

with needful guide-books ; but it will not do. It is not seaside weather ; in truth, it is not country weather at all. Then why not give up the country, and take to town-life ? And so comes about our change of plan, and the *Lingerings in German cities* of which we have to write.

Thus we resolve to spend what remains of vacation in leisurely visits to places we have already seen, but with which we are not familiar ; to revive old impressions, and to add new ; and for once in a way to settle down for at least a week in each place, and giving up all ideas of mountain-climbing and river-exploring, to try and make ourselves at home in each without extending our thoughts and wanderings beyond its suburbs.

As we are thus going over much old ground of which we treated five years ago, we shall try and avoid all vain repetitions, and aim at supplementing, as best we may, what the readers of the MONTH have already undergone, correcting, perhaps, some erroneous impressions which a first hasty visit may have made.

Should any new readers complain, naturally enough, of the meagerness of our descriptions, we refer them to those earlier pages just alluded to, and should they be good enough to peruse both, and yet feel unsatisfied, we can but repeat our frequent protestations, that we are not writing a guide-book, but only a simple record of what struck us in our rambles, as possibly amusing to others, since they have been so to ourselves.

So one evening last July we left London for Harwich, and found ourselves, after a calm and pleasant passage across, landing at the railway station at Rotterdam, ready for the morning train for Hanover.

We did not remain long, but yet we managed in that short time to commit two great mistakes in the form of grave omissions. We neither changed our English money, nor dined. We thought, poor simple creatures, that the morning was not the time for dinner, and that as the train would soon carry us out of Holland, we had no immediate need of foreign money. The consequence was, that we got no dinner at all, and that our English silver being refused at the stations, we were close upon Hanover and midnight before we could supplement the early breakfast we had taken on board the Harwich steamboat.

Perhaps this may have intensified the weariness we felt, especially in the latter part of our long journey through West-

phalia. Doubtless, from a manufacturing point of view, there is much that is interesting in the vast iron mines and factories which disfigure the landscape, while only at distant intervals snatches of river and hill scenery relieve the general dreariness; but it may safely be said that the country on the whole is not inviting, and that railways seem especially designed for the advantage of tourists in such lands, which cannot be said of those in less monotonous districts.

So the grand station at Hanover has an especial charm for us, though indeed it has need of no such adventitious aids to impress us favourably; for we know of few that can rival it, and very few indeed that can surpass it, as well in convenience, as in grandeur and nobleness of design. We have of course stations at home on as large a scale, and upon which doubtless more money has been spent, but here splendour is subordinated to convenience. The fine broad flights of stairs lead down into lofty and well-lighted corridors, which pass under the railway to waiting and refreshment rooms, as well as through them, into warm and bright entrance-halls of corresponding cheerfulness and splendour. Discomfort, the special characteristic of our termini, is here unknown; and so it is that we linger awhile and look about us, instead of wrapping ourselves up and hastening on in cold and darkness, as we should naturally do at home—a proceeding this, on the part of two hungry men, thus late at night, which is surely a high testimonial to the Hanover Railway Station.

We pass an equestrian statue, and along a gravel walk through flower-beds, to the Union Hotel, on the opposite side of the square, where a handsome room and a pleasant supper confirm at once the favourable impression already made upon us, and we fall asleep thinking, somewhat hazily it must be confessed, of the old city which has so new and cheerful a countenance.

Our thoughts by day, like our dreams by night, are at first none of the clearest respecting Hanover, and this perhaps because we had a preconceived picture in our mind with which the reality does not at all harmonize. We had hitherto avoided Hanover, under the impression that it was an out-of-the-way place, with grass-grown streets, given up to an English colony who were studying German on the most economical terms, and to a few old superannuated officials who were the wreck of a dissolved Court. Of course we should find in it a dilapidated

red-brick Residenz—Herrenhausen, as everybody knows—with little about it but the stale legends of the disreputable Court of our first two Georges. So we went on, picturing to ourselves what may be found in many an old duchy of Germany, a Pimpernickel without its Grand Transparencies—but it required very short stroll about the real Hanover to dissipate these idle dreams, and to show us as bright, busy, prosperous, and cheerful a city as one could wish for a first essay in “lingering.”

Of course, Hanover has had its ups and downs, like many a city of greater pretensions. Its temporary connection with England did it, perhaps, as much harm as good, raising it through its little Court into undue prominence, and then leaving it to shrivel up again by the absence of that which had puffed it out.

But somehow the sturdy little city struggled on, at times through, and at other times in spite of, its English Kings, and having backbone strong enough to bear and flourish under more recent growth, it developed quite naturally into the really fine city which it now is. The two last Kings of Hanover did much towards bringing about this satisfactory result. The statue we saw last night in front of the railway station and in the midst of the bright flowers is that which a grateful people erected to King Ernest, our English Duke of Cumberland, and right royal is the bearing of that handsome monarch. His son, George the Fifth, the late King, a still handsomer man than his father, did much to improve the city, and seems to have had a great love for palace-building. But the present German Government has done most in the way of enlarging the city, and thus the population has increased from twenty-five thousand to one hundred and twenty-five thousand during the last forty years. Hanover, like Alsace and Loraine—we beg pardon, Elsass and Lothringen—being an unwilling partner in the German Empire, seems to have been treated with that kind of petting Government which at least tries to reconcile the conquered to their inevitable destiny.

The consequence of all this is, that the city is at once interesting as a record of its own past peculiar history, especially in its temporary connection with England, and as a specimen of what modern Germany is daily more and more becoming under its new and yet old form of a vast Empire. As we stroll along its streets we may study the past, but at the same time we are not allowed to forget the present: both combine to give

Hanover a character of its own, and that a very different one from what our imagination had pictured.

The situation of Hanover is anything but striking. It stands in a vast plain, as flat and featureless as though it were in Holland; indeed, it has another Dutch characteristic, which makes the resemblance still more striking, for its little river, the Leine, is as ditchy as any Holland could supply. Fortunately the Leine does not intrude itself, and has to be sought out by any who may have a taste for it. And Hanover has done with its plain much the same as it has done with its river; it has shut in out of view by surrounding itself almost entirely with what might be called a forest, were it not intersected by numberless walks, adorned with small glades, bright flowers, and pleasant lawns, and planted with picturesque groups of trees, among which stand noble palaces and palatial mansions. In truth, it seems as if the people had planted the forest in self-defence against the dreary waste, and then turned it to another account by making it habitable and beautiful.

But if the city has thrust itself into its beautiful sylvan surroundings, the trees and flowers have returned the visit, and made themselves charmingly at home in the broad streets and open spaces. For the bright garden between our hotel and the grand railway station is but a specimen of what may be seen elsewhere. The noble opera house,—which owes so much of its splendour within and without to the blind King, our own Prince George of Cumberland, whose refined taste showed itself especially in music,—the opera house stands in the midst of a flower garden, and has its approaches under lofty trees and through gravel walks, which seem formed to calm the mind of the visitor from the distractions of active life, and to fit it for the thorough enjoyment of what music can afford.

But to understand this, we must bear in mind the difference between the circumstances and accessories of an opera in a German city and in London.

At Hanover, as we shall find elsewhere, the opera is almost an afternoon performance, at least, according to our English ways of dividing time. It begins about seven, and is over soon after nine. Bright daylight is without before and after the performance; and so the simple-mannered people walk to the theatre, lounge out amid the flowers between the acts, and quietly stroll home under the trees at the early hour we have mentioned. So the flowers and trees have much more to do

with the evening's enjoyment than Londoners would suppose. Unfortunately for us, the Hanover opera season had not begun when we were there in July, but subsequent happy experiences in Dresden furnished us with this idea of German opera life.

But the opera avenue has led us naturally enough to the opera house—alas! only to its closed doors; but in so doing it led us away from what we were writing about, namely, the abundance of trees and flowers which adorn and cool this bright and otherwise too warm city. Yes, strange to say, this July (1879) is very hot in Hanover. The sky is cloudless, and the broad streets are ablaze. Those who shuddered at home in this wet and cold summer will appreciate this advantage of foreign travel; but we in Hanover are at times ungrateful enough to complain and fly to the leafy shades which open to us on all sides and close at hand. Shall we again complain, and say that this abundance of fine avenues has its disadvantages, at least in this, that they are apt to mislead the stranger, as we found to our cost on more than one occasion; or, rather let us say, as we should have found to our cost had our time been limited and our programme of investigation rigidly fixed. But we are playing quite a new part as lingerers, and have hardly yet learned our lesson. So at first we feel disquieted, if not annoyed, at finding ourselves one day at the end of a long avenue, without any visible token of the palace we are in search of.

A long shaded avenue, with a tram line running through its midst, with Herrenhausen written plainly enough on the passing cars: we have no misgivings, but only wonder at the unexpected length of the well-shaded road. We diverge from our path, for a queer castellated building lies not far off the road, and we had been told to look for the King's last built palace in this direction.

When we arrived at the broad gate we find no mansion, at least for the living, but only a cemetery. Was it a grim joke about the last palace of the King? We enter, and find, as usual, broad walks, bright flowers, and monuments of all kinds; among others, that of Herr Devrient, the great actor, and husband to the still more renowned singer and actress, Schröder Devrient. However, there is no royal tomb here, so we pursue our walk, and at last come to the end of the avenue. There, sure enough, is the gate to the left by which we were directed to enter, and we find ourselves in another more shaded and

narrower avenue. On we stroll for a mile or two, but no Herrenhausen is to be seen. At last we come to a hunter's lodge in the forest, where of course are shady seats and wide-spreading trees. We rest and refresh ourselves, for the weather is hot even in this shade, and we are athirst in every sense. Again the avenue stretches itself seemingly interminably before us, and we pause. Evidently we have made a mistake, and it is growing late. A vista through the trees shows us Hanover in the distance, and we accept the beckoning homewards, and so return once more under trees, but altogether by a new route, and Herrenhausen is a pleasure of the future.

But though the opera house is closed, Hanover is not without its musical entertainments and theatres. But all indoor amusements are left behind with London, so our evenings are generally passed in Tivoli, which is a word somehow synonymous with eating, drinking, and music, at least, so our experience would conclude. Now, this Hanoverian Tivoli is an excellent specimen of the kind. It is, of course, filled with fine trees and flower-beds, and yet somehow tables and chairs innumerable find room enough, to say nothing of more formal terraces, on which large parties group together round large tables, and feast at their ease, while the promenaders feast their eyes upon beauty and splendour, which latter, indeed, has the additional charm of novelty in our eyes. Our first visit to Tivoli is on a military night, and we have military bands in addition to the regular gathering of solemn, professorial-looking musicians who evidently regard instrumental music as a serious profession, and not as a passing amusement.

But to-night the military have pretty nearly their own way, and the more solid music gives place to marches and polkas. But the splendour of which we spoke was to us the great wonder of the scene. Hanover is of course a great military centre under the German Empire, and the Vice-King is the general of a division, the tenth Corps d'Armée. Everybody is in the gardens, the great man and his numerous staff glitter with decorations; for every day in this military land seems to be a "collar day," and every one wears always and everywhere his decorations. Wonderful is the glitter of stars, crosses, and medals; brilliant and varied are the uniforms. We are fairly dazzled and perplexed. What a host of heroes surrounds us! The man the King delighted to honour is everywhere. Decorations are upon all—not, of course, in equal profusion, but no one seemed undis-

tinguished. We almost feel ashamed of our own plain dress, and have to console ourselves with the story of Castlereigh at Vienna, and his distinction of being without a single distinction.

But the scene was in truth a very brilliant one, and the decorated looked worthy of their decorations, and wore them as men who had deserved well of their country and had their services thus recognized. The road to Herrenhausen is in due time discovered. We were before upon the line, but were pursuing it in the wrong direction, as country cousins will take the omnibus on its way to Paddington when their destination is the Bank. We shall bear more patiently with country cousins for the future, after our misadventure in Hanover.

Another beautiful avenue, which runs through a fine park, with a tram-line just outside, and under the shade of the trees which form its boundary, leads by the Welfenschloss (the palace of the Guelphs), built by the late King, to the gates of Herrenhausen. It is a "fountains' day," and the people are making themselves at home in the royal gardens as Germans are wont to do. The shabby old Residenz—it was never a palace—is shut up and inaccessible. We clamber up a flight of steps which leads to a very stagey bridge over the top of a mild cascade, and look down upon the once private gardens upon which the lower rooms open. Stiff and formal must it have been at all times with its grim orange-trees in wooden buckets, but now it is desolation itself. George the First built it for the Countess Platen, says Murray, and then adds, what seems somewhat incongruous, that the Electress Sophia, his mother, dropped down dead in the garden here—that grand old Electress, the youngest child of the unhappy Princess Palatine, who yearned so after the crown of England, and who would have worn it well, had she not thus suddenly died only a few months before Queen Anne.

The gardens are large, extending over one hundred and twenty acres, of that formal design which is seen in perfection at Versailles. How the denizens of the Court of the Georges disported themselves therein is only too well known. Perhaps their revels, if less stately than those of the Grand Monarque, were quite as correct. There are the trim and stately walks, as straight as line could make them, with the high clipped hedges as unnatural and almost as rigid as the sylvan fawns, the gods and goddesses, the nymphs and graces which moulder at the angles and decorate the fountains, which alone seem to

have life and to resist the trammels which would force them into stiffness. There, too, is the sylvan theatre, perhaps as perfect in every detail as in those days when Mesdames of Kielmansegge and Schulemburg danced in it—those ladies upon whom the amorous King afterwards conferred the titles of Countess of Darlington and Duchess of Kendal, and the irreverent English people those of Maypole and Elephant.

Strange theatre, indeed, which needs only the gardener's clippers to keep it in order. The smooth turf is its floor; its front, side-scenes, and background are cut into shape, like the stiff walks which lead up to it, out of the thick hedges, which rise to any required height. All this, which is Nature's work still, though under such strange contortions, is fresh and bright, and were the statues and groups which decorate it cleaned up, it would look as well as ever. A broad gravel walk sweeps in front of it on a lower level, having on the further side semi-circular stone seats rising tier above tier, on which those who took no part in the performances looked on, while many of as high and still higher rank disported themselves in Watteau—perhaps in Teniers—groups, sometimes in the bright sunlight, but oftener under the twinkling of lamps, which dealt more mercifully with the faces which in those days it was the fashion in Hanover to daub with white and red paint.

But the rustic theatre, like the poor old Residenz, is deserted—as much a thing of the past as the first Georges and their queer and disreputable surroundings. The fountains seem the only free, almost the only living things in the place, so naturally enough the people cluster around them, and children sport beneath their rainbow showers. There are many old buildings scattered through the city which are striking enough in their way, though brick is the chief material used; for the simple material has been wrought effectively into designs which are anything but commonplace. The Market Church (Markt Kirche), as it is quaintly called, is a plain enough building of the fourteenth century, and owes whatever effect it produces externally to its size. But the Town Hall (Rathhaus), opposite, a century younger, is thoroughly Hanoverian. The front is decorated with coats of arms, while full-length figures crown the walls, with the high-pitched roof for background. The brick is wrought into fine mouldings, and as much of it is glazed, it has a very brilliant effect in the sunlight. The adjacent streets are filled with quaint houses of the same period: the wonderfully high

pitched roofs have several rows of dormer lights, which seem to imply several storeys in the roof. Many of these lights are opened out by an oblong curve of the tiles, with a circular window underneath, and closely resemble enormous eyes looking out and down upon the street below.

There is much plaster-work in the fronts of these houses, and sometimes stone-work: in both cases covered with quaint devices, dates, and inscriptions. There is food enough for the antiquarian, as well as for the lover of the picturesque and the grotesque, in these long narrow streets, while for those whose taste is for more modern refinement, there is no lack of fine, broad modern streets, with large shops. But if the "lingerer" has a taste for both combined, there are streets and terraces in the bright green suburbs of modern antique villas, where in the midst of flowers, trees, and flowering shrubs, shut in by no high walls, refined taste has adapted to modern requirements the Renaissance and mediæval forms, which contrast boldly with one another, and yet out of that very contrast skilfully bring about a harmonious whole. These private residences, still more than the magnificent public offices, which are built in the old, simple, and massive style, testify to the prosperity of the fair city, which is evidently growing apace, since new avenues are being opened up and filled with equally excellent and costly houses.

The Catholic church is a fine and stately building, and at the High Mass on Sunday was crowded to the doors. The congregation must have been very large; for the people were mostly standing in a dense mass, and singing, as Germans are wont to do, with all their might. Lingerer pleasantly about the broad streets or in the shady avenues, among the bright flowers and the pleasant gardens, and at times losing ourselves in the denser and less frequented paths of the surrounding forests, we did not feel inclined to visit second-class picture galleries, or museums of doubtful interest. We were not "doing" Hanover, like some pleasant people we met, who did everything in a single day, and went away wearied, and yet eager for the next city. No; we lounged about and enjoyed the people—the natural, out-door pictures—and studied the museums which ranged their collections in streets of ancient houses and in quaint gables and grotesque decorations, and perhaps we carried away more of Hanover with us than those who rushed about, Murray or Baedeker in hand, and saw every registered sight in due order.

One excursion we did indeed make, and devoted a day to its careful examination; but the grand old cathedral city of Hildesheim, and its shrines of saints, and churches worthy of the rich treasures they contain, are not to be brought in at the end of a chapter, but require—as they shall have—another paper to themselves.

HENRY BEDFORD.

On the Perception of the Senses.

PART THE THIRD.—THE ACT OF SENSATION.

IT has been often remarked that every error is but the perversion or exaggeration of one particular phase of a many-sided truth. This holds good of the theory of subjective sensation as well as all else. For the theory of subjective sensation is but a distortion or exaggeration of the fact that our external senses perceive external objects *as those objects represent themselves to us*. It is true therefore that in all sensation there is a certain subjective limitation of the external reality, but it is not true that sensation is wholly subjective. It is true that the objective element is in some sense modified by the faculty which perceives it, but it is not true that the objective element disappears to make way for what is subjective. It is true that we directly and immediately perceive the object as represented to us, but it is not true that in external sensation we directly and immediately perceive the representation instead of the object. It is true that the species must be present in the material organ of the living faculty before the object can be perceived, but it is not true that it is the species, either the species *impressa* or the species *expressa*, which is itself perceived. It is true that the species is the *medium quo*, but it is not true that the species is the *medium in quo*. These are the points in which we find ourselves in conflict with the advocates of the theory of subjective sensation, or as it is sometimes called of representative perception, and we accuse them of a confusion of thought in identifying *the object as represented to us* with *a representation of the object*, a confusion which leads to all the contradictory results which we pointed out last month.

The whole doctrine which we are going to put forward may be summed up in the expression we have just used. The species is the *medium quo* and not the *medium in quo*. Our argument will be merely an exposition of this short sentence. We shall begin by explaining the difference between the *medium quo* and the

medium in quo. When we say that we perceive one external object by means of another we may mean one of two things. We may either mean that we see the one object *in* the other, or we may mean that we see the one object *by* or *through* the other. In the first case the object of sight is primarily and directly the thing which serves as a medium; secondarily and indirectly the thing which is seen is the medium. For instance, when we see the moon reflected in a calm piece of water, the direct and primary object of sight is the water. The indirect and secondary object of sight is the moon which is reflected in the water. Here the water is the *medium in quo*. In the second case, that is, when we see one object by or through another, the primary and direct object of sight is no longer the medium but the object itself which is seen through the medium. For instance, when we look at the moon through a telescope, the primary and direct object of sight is the moon and not the telescope; in fact, we need not see the telescope at all or even be aware of its existence. Here the telescope is the *medium quo*. The difference, then, between the *medium in quo*, the medium *in* which we perceive an object, and the *medium quo*, the medium *by* or *through* which we perceive it is this: the *medium in quo* must be seen first, in order that the object of which it is the medium may be seen afterwards; the *medium quo* need not be, and often is not, seen at all, but the object of which it is the medium is seen distinctly and primarily: in the case of the *medium in quo*, we see not the object itself, but a representation of the object; in the case of the *medium quo*, we see the object itself as it is represented through the medium.

If the doctrine of subjective sensation, or, as it is sometimes called, representative perception, were true, we should have to see first the impression or representation, and afterwards the thing represented, the external object which made the impression: the impression would be the direct and primary object of sight, the external object, the indirect and secondary object. We have already shown why it is that this cannot possibly be the case. We will now examine a little more at length the positive side of our doctrine of sensation, and explain the part which the species plays as the *medium quo*, the means by which we attain a direct and primary and immediate knowledge of the object outside of us.

There are three ways in which the species expressa, the vital image within us, acts as the *medium quo* of the external

object which it represents. First of all, it is the likeness or representation of the external object in the faculty, and thus takes its place as the vicegerent of the object in the faculty. For all knowledge consists of an assimilation of the being who knows, to the object known, and this assimilation must be effected through some medium or means which shall convey to the cognisant being the necessary likeness to the thing known. Now sensation is a form of knowledge, and therefore in sensation there must be an assimilation of the faculty perceiving to the thing perceived through some medium which shall represent the thing in the faculty. Through this representative medium the faculty is enabled to form within itself such a likeness to the thing perceived as to be thereby qualified for the act of perception. Now in sensation the species expressa is this representative medium which assimilates the faculty perceiving to the thing perceived, and enables the faculty to perceive the thing. In the second place, the species expressa is the very act of perception itself in its final accomplishment. All sensation as a manifestation of life necessarily involves an act by means of which the faculty proceeds to a knowledge of the object. This act is the *medium quo*, the means by which it reaches the object, and so attains to a knowledge of it. Without such a medium the dormant faculty would remain for ever dormant; a determinate action on its part is necessary, if it would make acquaintance with things without, and therefore the species expressa, as the completed act, is the means without which the faculty could not accomplish its knowledge of its object. And thirdly, the species expressa is the medium of communication through which the faculty tends directly to its object. It is the vital image of the object, and therefore has in itself a certain tendency towards the external object, not a mere material or physical tendency, but a vital, or as it is sometimes called an intentional tendency, not a tendency like that of the arrow to its mark, but rather like the tendency of our thoughts to the things of which we think, or of our appetites to the objects of their desire.

Such are the three ways in which the species expressa is the *medium quo*, in which the completed sensation is the means by which the faculty is united with its object; it is a *representation*, an *act*, a *tendency*. We have already spoken of the first and second of these. We have shown how the external object imprints itself upon the faculty, and how from this impression

is developed the species expressa, the representation or likeness of the object in the faculty. We have also shown how the species expressa is the very act of sensation in its accomplishment, by which act the faculty perceives its object. We will now say a few words about the third way in which the species expressa is a medium of communication between the sentient faculty and the external object, viz., by its tendency or direction towards the object. For as in the beginning of the sensation the object acted on the faculty by means of the species impressa, now the faculty acts upon the object by means of the species expressa, although in quite a different way. The action and the reaction differ in kind. For the object at the commencement of the sensation did not act vitally, but with a purely physical tendency; whereas the species expressa existing in the faculty acts upon the object vitally and with an intentional tendency. We call it an intentional tendency because it resembles the tendency of our intentions to some object which we purpose to attain; it differs from a purely physical or material tendency in several particulars. (1) Its action is immanent, that is, it is confined to the faculty and does not go outside of it. (2) As a necessary result of this, it has no physical or material effect on the object to which it tends. (3) It can even tend to an object which is physically absent. (4) It is itself expressive of its object: although it never goes out of the faculty, it nevertheless has the power of positing its object outside of the faculty. (5) Although ultimately determined from without, the immediate determination of the species expressa is from within, and it may for this reason tend to an object which at the present moment has no objective existence. One or two interesting results follow from these characteristics of the intentional tendency of the species to its object. If it can tend to an object which is absent, it follows that we can perceive, see, hear, and feel something which is not physically present to us. This paradox is true if we confine ourselves to the completed act of perception, and not to every step in the perceptive process—to the last scene in the act, and not to the whole act. To the whole act it is absolutely necessary, at least in the normal action of our faculties, that the object should be physically present, in order that the first step of the sensation, the reception of the species impressa, should take place. But when once the impression has been received, then the object has played its part by actively contributing to its own per-

ception. If we could suppose the object to disappear instantaneously after the impression had been made upon the eye, we should still see it just the same; the species expressa would be generated within the faculty, and would tend to the object just as if the object were still physically present. This it would do by reason of its power itself to posit or express its object. Such a case is practically almost impossible, by reason of the exceedingly rapid and momentary character of the process of sensation, but the fact is interesting, as bearing on the question of visions, whether real or imaginary. In the case of a true vision, Almighty God imprints upon the vital faculties the representation of the object which is perceived in the vision: the eye of the person who witnesses the vision receives upon the retina of the eye the species impressa of that which is seen in the vision, and the faculty acting in conjunction with this species produces by a purely natural process the species expressa in which the act of sight consists. In an imaginary vision the process is very similar, except that in this case the species impressa is not produced in the faculty by the action of Almighty God, but has its source either in the mental or physical peculiarities of the person seeing the vision. Either the imagination, acting on its organ, the brain, generates in the faculty of sight a species impressa of which the source is internal, and has no corresponding object present to our sight, or else the brain, acting under some physical or nervous influence, produces the same result. A person of a powerful imagination, whose thoughts have long dwelt on some one object, at last has that object so vividly imprinted on his internal sense that, by reason of the intimate connection which exists between the internal and the external senses, it reproduces itself after a time in one or other of his external senses. The internal sense, determined by this image present to it, generates in the external sense a species impressa which in this case comes from within, not from without—is subjective, and not objective in its origin. Such hallucinations are by no means uncommon. The favourite tune which we have so often heard seems ever to be ringing in our ears; the only son, on whom the mother's thoughts continually dwell, at last comes to be present to her sight, not only in her dreams and sleep, but even under the broad light of the open day. Or it may be that the derangement is a physical one; long intemperance has affected the tissue of the brain, and since the brain is the organ

of the fancy, its abnormal condition causes the fancy to do some abnormal work. At the same time the brain communicates its diseased condition to the optic nerve, and the optic nerve to the eye; and thus again the species impressa is produced from within, not from without, subjectively not objectively, and the drunkard sees those strange forms which haunt and terrify him. But in all such cases we cannot draw any definite line between phenomena which spring from a mental source and those which arise from bodily disease; often the two are combined, or at all events the diseased body produces an unhealthy condition of the mind.

Thus we see how, in the normal action of the faculty, it is enough that the species impressa should be received from some external object, in order that the sensation may be completed, and how in the abnormal case of visions, real or imaginary, the species impressa really exists in the organ, although it is abnormally produced there; the necessary conditions for the complete act of sensation exist, and so the object is really and truly seen. The act of sensation depends in every case on the presence in the organ of the species impressa. When our faculties are in their normal state, the presence of the species impressa in the organ necessarily postulates the presence of an external object from which it is received; in their abnormal condition it can be abnormally produced without the presence of the external object. This abnormal production proves nothing against our argument; the contortions of the galvanized corpse are no valid objection to the proposition that the exertion of muscular energy is a sign of life. The instances of visions and hallucinations do not in any way impugn the general proposition that we can see only what is actually present before us and without us, because such a physical proposition, like all physical propositions, is applicable only to natural action, and not to supernatural or abnormal interference, whether proceeding from the power of God or from a diseased condition of mind or body.

I have said that the tendency, then, of the species expressa, the representative image of the external object, to its object is an intentional and not a mere physical tendency. Just as the species impressa is itself the complement of the act of sensation, so we may say that the tendency inherent in it is the complement of the reaction which is going on while the sensation is progressing towards its accomplishment. The reaction and the tendency are the incomplete and the completed accompaniment

of the incomplete and the completed sensation. From this an important consequence may be deduced. For the reaction of which we are speaking is the result of the previous action of the object on the faculty, and the tendency of the species to the object is the final stage of this reaction. Now, from the very nature of reaction, it follows the reaction of the faculty on the object necessarily begins and ends where the action of the object on the faculty was first received by the faculty ; that is, the reaction begins and ends in the special organ of the faculty. The action of the coloured object upon the faculty of sight was received in the eye as the organ of sight, and therefore the reaction of the faculty on the object begins and ends in the eye. The action of the delicate perfume was received in the organ of smell, and therefore the reaction begins and ends in the same organ. From this it follows that the complement of this reaction, the tendency of the species *expressa* to its object, takes place in the special organ to which the object originally conveyed its representative impression. In other words, the completed sensation, the species *expressa*, tending to the external object, is to be looked for not in the brain, as is asserted by the advocates of subjective sensation, but in one of the special organs of sense. When we see an external object, the sensation of sight is completed in the eye, not in the brain ; when we hear some noise, the sensation of hearing is completed in the ear, not in the brain ; when we touch a rough or hard object with our finger, the sensation of roughness or hardness is completed in our finger, not in the brain ; the reason of this being that when the action of the external object on the sentient faculty begins, then the reaction proceeding from the sentient faculty to the external object is necessarily perfected.

We may also put the same argument in another form. If the sensation is perfected in the brain, and not in the external organ, it follows that the organ is simply a medium through which the brain receives the sensation : the eyes and ears and nose and mouth, in fact, all our vital organs are so many glasses or tubes, through which the brain perceives the objects without us, and whose only function is to receive the impression from the object and transmit it to the brain, where the act of sensation is completed. If this theory be true, the eye receives the colour from the coloured object, and transmits it to the brain, where the sensation is perfected, and the act of sight is finally accomplished ; the ear receives the sound from the object which

produces it, and sends it on to the brain, where the act of hearing receives its completion; the touch receives a certain impression which we call heat, and merely forwards it to the brain, where the sensation of warmth receives its final development; and so with all the other organs of sense. But, as a matter of fact, the organs of sense do nothing of the sort: the eye does not forward to the brain the colour which it receives, but it receives the impression of colour, and, as a consequence of this impression, it transmits either to the brain or to some nervous centre, a certain affection of the optic nerve, but this affection is not colour; the colour, as colour, never reaches the brain at all, but remains in the eye, where it was first received, and never gets beyond it. At best there is but a certain communication with the brain, without which the sensation of colour cannot be perfected in the eye, but the eye retains its right to the sole possession of colour as such. Let us take a parallel case. A victorious general desires to conclude a treaty with his defeated enemy, but he cannot sign the treaty until he has telegraphed to the central government for authorization to do so. It does not follow from this that the treaty is signed in the place where the central government is sitting. The treaty as such remains on the field of battle until the whole transaction has taken place and every necessary condition has been fulfilled. There it begins, and there it receives its final completion. So it is with the sensation: in the organ it begins and in the organ it receives its final accomplishment.

But let us take an instance which comes under the sense of touch. We hold our hand near the fire, and the skin receives a certain impression which we call heat. According to the theory of our opponents, this impression is sent on to the brain, and there the sensation of warmth is accomplished. But if this were so, if heat as heat were transmitted to the brain, the temperature of the brain would immediately rise when the hand or foot approached the fire, and we know that this is not the case. Our opponents cannot answer that the warmth is generated in the hand or foot, and the feeling of warmth in the brain, because warmth and the feeling of warmth are one and the same thing; unless, indeed, they mean by the feeling of warmth the consciousness of warmth, in which case they confuse together the sensation and the consciousness of the sensation. We fully allow, and, indeed, assert that the consciousness of the sensation has its seat in the brain: we deny that the sensation itself is

accomplished there. Hence we may fall back with renewed security on the evidence of our own common sense and on the general agreement of mankind, which tell us that where the sensation is begun, there it is accomplished. Here, as always, a more careful investigation of facts testifies to the veracity of our consciousness. The testimony of our internal perceptions is, in the case of normal action, wholly and fully reliable. The natural tendency of human nature is to truth, and where our nature deceives us, it is by reason of some defect or disease existing either in mind or body. This tendency to truth is the mainstay of all true philosophy: vainly does the shallow theory or the false hypothesis struggle against it. Error may for a time cause some partial disturbance and hinder the progress of human thought; yet sooner or later it is sure to be swept away by the stream which rolls onwards towards the sea of truth.

Our argument, then, leads us to this conclusion—that the species *expressa*, in its character of a *medium quo*, is a means of communication between the external object and the external sense, and by its aid the sense perceives the object; that it does not convey anything from the brain to the object, because its tendency resides in the organ where the sensation is accomplished, but that it starts, if we may so speak, from the organ, and thence posits the object outside the organ, although at the same time its action is immanent in the organ, and does not in any way go outside of it physically, but only intentionally. But we must not dismiss this part of our subject without explaining how far the action of the brain is necessary to an act of sensation. For although the impression is made on the organ of sense, though the sensation begins and ends in the organ, though the tendency of the completed sensation to the object has its seat in the organ, yet it seems that in some way the brain is necessary to sensation, because parts cut off from the brain are unable to feel. The question, it is true, is a physiological rather than a psychological one, but we have been compelled to allude to it more than once; and though we shall not attempt to enter into details, we will indicate a few of the leading facts, referring the reader to some work on physiology for a full discussion of it.

Is the action of the brain necessary for an ordinary act of sensation? Must there be a communication with the brain in order that the impression received into the faculty may be developed into the complete sensation? Is the concurrence

of the brain with the special organ of sense necessary to the production of the species expressa?

Before answering this question we must again recur to the distinction between a sensation simply, and a sensation of which we are conscious, or a conscious sensation. In English the word sensation is often used ambiguously, and we must guard against any such confusion of terms. By sensation then we mean the act which necessarily takes place in the vital organ as the seat of the vital faculty, by reason of a certain impression received from an external object. By a sensation of which we are conscious, or a conscious sensation, we mean such an act, accompanied by a consciousness that it is taking place, on the part of the living being who performs the act, so that he may be said to be aware of it, or to perceive it. Of course the word conscious is not here used in its strict and proper sense, since consciousness, strictly speaking, is an intellectual act; we are here including in it that perception which animals as well as men possess of their own sensitive acts. We will therefore divide our question into two parts.

1. Is the concurrence of the brain necessary to sensation?
2. Is the concurrence of the brain necessary to a consciousness of sensation?

The first part of the question we distinctly answer in the negative, if we mean by the brain that portion of the living organism which is situate within the skull. For when one of the lower animals, a pigeon, for instance, or a frog, has its brains extracted, it may be kept alive after the process for several weeks. It will swallow the food put into its mouth, it will show signs of muscular irritation if a strong acid be applied to its skin, it will shrink from burning heat; the pupil of its eye will contract if a strong light be placed close to it. But it will show no sign whatever of any feeling of pleasure and pain, and will perform no act whatever which depends on the internal sense, on the memory, or on the imagination. Its action is limited to the necessary process which we call external sensation; its movements are those which are necessarily produced by the motor nerves as the result of a sensation in one of the vital organs. Such action is sometimes called reflex action, as opposed to that in which the sentient being himself appears to have some share as a spontaneous agent; it is half-way between the vital action proper to the plant and that proper to the animal, in that it exhibits no indication of the adaptation of

means to ends on the part of the being which performs it. In the case of men, the same kind of action takes place when any part of the body is precluded from communication with the brain by reason of a paralysis of the spinal marrow, or an injury affecting the brain itself. The external impression made upon the organ produces all the results which immediately follow from the completed sensation merely as an external sensation, situate in the external organ of sense, but produces nothing beyond this; there is no feeling of pain if the organ thus cut off be cut or burnt; it has no perception whatever of what takes place in it; the will has no control over its movements. These facts lead us to the conclusion that the sensation as a bare fact may be accomplished without any communication with the brain.

But now let us go a step further, and separate some limb, not only from the brain, but from the centres of sensation which lie outside the brain proper; instead of removing the brain or dividing the spinal marrow of our frog or pigeon, let us suppose, if our anti-vivisection friends will allow us the supposition, the sensory nerves to be cut through which lead from its limbs to the ganglia, or nervous centres, lying outside the spine. What is the result under these new circumstances of an impression made upon one of the parts thus severed? There is no result whatever, no trace of any kind of sensation, no reflex action, no movement following upon the impression from without. The part cut off from its nervous centre lives only a vegetable life; its sensitive powers are entirely lost. It is the same with animals and with men; no trace appears of any vital or muscular action whenever there is a complete paralysis of one of the limbs, or when the sensory nerves have been severed which connect any part of the body with its central ganglion.

Hence we may conclude that the external sensation does not in itself require any communication with the brain for its accomplishment, but does require a communication with some nervous centre lying outside the brain. At the same time, the seat of the sensation is not the nervous centre, but the external organ of sense. But the sensation cannot be perfected in the organ of sense before it has telegraphed its message to the nervous centre and received an answer back.

Our second question, whether conscious sensation can be perfected without some communication with the brain, can be very easily answered. When the brain is paralyzed, or removed,

or so injured as to be unable to act, a total unconsciousness is the never-failing result; all the animal functions may be performed, local sensation may appear to go on as before, but the man or animal so afflicted is wholly and entirely unaware of everything which takes place in him and around him. In the same way, if the communication be cut off between any portion of the body and the brain, the man or animal loses all consciousness of all that takes place in that particular portion of the body. It makes no difference whether the severance takes place between the organ of sense and the nervous centre outside the brain, or between this nervous centre and the brain itself: in either case there is a total unconsciousness on the part of the living being of all that goes on in the organ. In the one case the external sensation is not accomplished; in the other it is accomplished, but is unable to pass to the brain: but in both the results are precisely the same as far as regards any consciousness of its accomplishment.

From this it follows that to conscious sensation a communication with the brain is absolutely necessary. On this point there can be no doubt whatever. Destroy the action of the brain, or cut off connection with it, and we cannot tell whether sensation takes place or not. On the other hand, given an active brain and a free communication, and we are aware of every sensation which is accomplished in us. But here another question suggests itself—where does this act of consciousness take place? Is it accomplished, like the sensation, in the organ or in the brain? This perception of external sensations is an act of the internal sense, which among its other functions has that of receiving the reports of all that goes on in the external organs of sense, and so enabling the sentient being to become aware of his own external sensations. It is possessed by animals as well as by men, and is sometimes so highly developed in them as to be mistaken by the empirical observer for the first germs of reason. Now this internal sense has its seat in the brain, and therefore it is in the brain, and not in the organ of the external sense, that the perception of the external sensation is accomplished. Here it is that we may join hands with those who assert that sensation is perfected in the brain. If they only meant that the perception or consciousness of sensation is to be looked for in some process of the brain, we should fully agree with them; if they meant that the internal sense has its seat in the brain, we should have no fault to find

with their doctrine. But they do not do this. They tell us that the act of sight is accomplished in the brain; whereas they ought to say, that the act of sight is accomplished in the eye, and the conscious perception of the act of sight in the brain. They confuse together external and internal sensation, and use the word sensation indiscriminately for both.

The positive results which we have now arrived at are as follows. The species expressa is the *medium quo*, the means by which we perceive the external object, not the *medium in quo*, the medium in which we perceive in it. It acts as the *medium quo* in three ways: (1) as representing the object in the faculty, (2) as the accomplished act of sensation, (3) as having within itself a tendency to the object. This tendency is not a mere physical tendency, but an intentional one; it does not go outside of the faculty or influence the object; it may tend to that which is not physically present, since it posits or expresses the object outside of itself.

From the nature of this tendency we deduced the fact that the sensation is accomplished in the organ of sense, and not in the brain. We proved this fact by a separate argument derived from the object of sensation, and we then explained how far the brain is necessary to sensation, and whether it is in any sense true that sensation is accomplished in the brain, and not in the external organ of sense.

RICHARD F. CLARKE.

*The Adventures of Twelve Catholic Students.*¹

PART THE SECOND.

THE narrative of the anonymous writer proceeds in the following terms:—

“This morning, about nine of the clock, we discovered a ship coming from the coast of Spain, now riding up the high mountains of waters, or rather, as it seemed to our watery eyes, upon the clouds, then again falling into abysses of valleys. She was not seen of us again of almost a quarter of an hour; thus cutting forward her uneven course by ascents and descents, till at length she overtook us. This sight a little cheered us up, when we observed there were yet some people floating above the waves besides ourselves; conceiving hence that there were some hopes remaining of escaping death at this time as well for us as our neighbours. This was an English ship, as his red cross upon his sprete^c made show; but better able to bear off and encounter the billows than we were by reason of his lighter burden, as especially by the industry, skill, and courage of her pilot and mariners. To this Englishman we made signs with hats in hands to draw near us (for now all voices were drowned betwixt wind and water), who very courteously ventured himself within one ship's length of us, for nearer it was not safe, lest by force of some wave the ships might one rush against the other.

Here some of our company, less confident in the providence of Almighty God, or too fearful of apprehending death by famine, if not by water, solicited this our countryman, with more importunity than I am able to express, to receive them into his ship and set them in a port of England, and he should be rewarded according to his desire; for here we wanted necessary food, and our ship being of very slow sail and without any defence, was subject to the pillaging of every enemy. His answer was that he should be glad to do his countrymen any

¹ Continued from vol. xviii. p. 549.

good office that lay in his power ; but for the present he could not do what they requested, for it was impossible to set his cock-boat upon the rough waves without imminent danger both of men and boat ; and to come so near us that we might leap from ship to ship was neither safe for himself nor us, lest he might venture the splitting of both ships. He desired us therefore to pardon him, and so bade us adieu.

Our mariners, amongst other things, had demanded of these Englishmen what danger of pirates there was towards the Cape of St. Vincent, and whether they had not heard of seven Turkish pirates that rode thereabouts. He answered that the coast was clear, and that if we had two days since come that way we might have had a most safe convoy to St. Lucar, because seven of the King of Spain's galloons had been that way to scour the coast. Whence we began to understand the fraud of our Holland guide, perceiving he had brought us from the safeguard of the Spaniards to we knew not what danger. This news put diverse doubts into our mariners' heads, whether it were better now again to turn back again for Spain, or to hold on their course for England. Their certificate and letters of ingrossment from the city of Hamburg were for Spain, as also the hopes of greater gain by their merchandise. On the other side, the safety of the way towards England, with the more speedy return to their own country, and the indifferency of their commodities they carried, invited them to steer forwards. It is not unlikely they also consulted whether any benefit might be made by presenting us twelve to the Council of England, but of this we could not be certain. Yet we perceived they neither loved our company nor our religion.

Whilst these things, and many others which we were not privy to, were in agitation, the winds began to blow more mildly and clouds dispersed, the comfortable sun appeared warm, and we came creeping forth of our holes to receive the comfort of God's blessings. All our mouths were so seasoned, or rather sweetened, with ejaculatories, that every one's words sounded nothing but God's praises and the magnifying and excelling His goodness towards us. Our mariners, like weathercocks, not able to guide their course by reason, but following the motion of the winds, held on their course begun towards England all this day and the next, when (being within a day's sail of Plymouth) it came into their shallow brains that the exchange of bay salt, which they were to return to their masters—a great commodity

in *Almaine*—was not to be had in England. This objection convinced them quite; wherefore, without once discarding the matter, they return the prow round once again for Spain, after four days back for England. Which their inconstancy was a direct course to clem us to death, having so small store of provision in their ship: such was the weakness and want of discretion in our master and his mariners.

From this time forward our constant diet was bread, if it might deserve so good a name, made of beans and barley which (as we could prudently conjecture) could not be less than three or four years old, and had twice so many times been mouldy and rotten in musty old holes, and as often baked or dried again. It had in it more colours than the rainbow: white, black, blue, yellow, green, red, and some other medleys; yet by often rebaking made as hard as brickbats, so that before we could proportion or accommodate it to our mouths it must be knocked in pieces with mallets and hatchets, dulling, turning, or nicking the edges of our best knives to cut it. Yet would it have been tolerable might but water have been allowed to soak it in. Thus we fed, our mariners having for the most part better for themselves. This we were wont to lay to air half a day in the sun and wind before we ate it, such an unsavory stench came from it.

Our drink was water, such as even now I abhor to describe; for besides that it was in a very small allowance, namely, a quart can at a meal amongst twelve of us (a proportion fitter so many sparrows than so many parched empty stomachs), it was so corrupted with keeping in unclean vessels, and stunk so abominably, that when we supped off our pittance in a little wooden dish which we kept for that diversion, we stopt our noses lest by the offence of that sense we might be at a loss and turn it up again. Yet this water was of such price with us, that it was held no small stratagem to cheat the sloven Hans, our drawwater, of a can of it; and if we missed in such a project, many times to our pain we would be making trial of salt water, which both searched our entrails and augmented our thirst. Otherwhiles we were wont to hang our handkerchiefs upon the tacklings to gather the dew of the night, which we sucked to refresh our mouths; or if any drops of rain had fallen, we would lick them from the ropes. This was our constant fare for ten days at least.

Upon the 5th of September, being now again about a day's

sail from the Cape of St. Vincent, we were overtaken by a very stately-built ship of about eight hundred tons, setting forth about fifty brass pieces of ordnance, and having in her eighty men of service. This was the Admiral of the Holland navy, commanded by Captain Quest, a man in person and apparel more like some rich-nosed brewer in his red cap and waistcoat than an Admiral of the high and mighty States, as they term themselves. This was a true Statesman; and therefore, finding us friends and that we conveyed lawful wares, had nothing to say either to our men or ship. Yet some few questions he demanded about our Dunkirker that was taken to Holland by Jacob May: how he was taken, and what merchandise he carried, expecting what may be his share out of the prize. He had also notice given him of the other Hollander, whom we had lost in the storm; but he presently told us that was no Statesman, but a pirate, and therefore God had blessed us well from him, for doubtless, if time and season would have permitted him, he had either sold us to the Turks or thrown us overboard. Then he asked our master what company he had in his ship; to whom the steersman, in a jeering manner, made answer that besides ten of themselves, they had also Twelve Apostles, travelling to Spain, there to study, to convert England.

Amongst others that attended upon this Hollander, two were Englishmen, Londoners; which, hearing of Englishmen going to study in Spain, thought they might do their King and country a great piece of service if they should make some strange discovery upon us. Wherefore, in their red caps and blue waistcoats, they sat down, and like Justices of the Peace they examined us about our native countries, our names, our parents, our intentions in going to Spain, our education at St. Omer's, and the like. And we, considering their commission, were nothing short (for all our misery) in returning them unhappy answers; and nothing being proved against us, we were quit; and with a prosperous gale, upon the third day of the month, betimes in the morning, we discovered the Spanish coast, and within two hours after came under the fort of the long-desired Cape of St. Vincent; where, being now in safety from enemies and storms, a sweet calm arrested us, as willing to refresh our wearied bodies and benumbed spirits.

Being now no less weary of the sea than we were taken with the safety of the harbour and beauty of the pleasant country, we earnestly besought our master skipper to set us on shore, laying

open to him the facility of doing it, our weariness of the sea, the want of provisions, and the danger we were in of the Turks if we but stirred from the safety of that fort. But his answer was that if the wind favoured we should to-morrow altogether be at our journey's end, that if we were in want of food and in danger of Turks and pirates, his wants were no less and his and his servants' danger was as great, who were more dear to him than we, therefore we should expect and share like fortunes together. But we, conceiving his main difficulty to be lest we should slip away without paying for our wharfage, consulted together what course might be taken, and finding that amongst us all there was yet remaining, after the Hollanders' pillaging, the sum of ten pounds of concealed money, we agreed together that those which had it should be content to dispense it for the common good, and secure it again when we should come to our journey's end. Wherefore, to win the master's and steersman's goodwill to set us on shore, we offered them on hand five pounds, and five pounds more when it should be demanded by either of them at our English College at Seville, a far greater proportion than was due to them; all of us offering our oaths for the performance thereof. This golden allurements won their goodwill, yet, because their own cockboat was little, they said they were not willing to venture us in it, but promised to set us shortly into a fisher's boat which roamed there not far from them, and would doubtless ere long come towards them. We long looked for the drawing near of this fisher boat, but at length, observing that it rather declined further from us, we (with the little air which now towards the evening began to rise) removed from under the fort, partly to gather wind to sail away that night, but especially to speak with that fisherman.

And no sooner were we out of the reach of the ordnance of the fort but our fisher boat turns with all speed upon us, and scarce had we begun to rejoice in his approach but we discovered the half-moon on the top of his little mast, and bye-and-by heard such a frightful *celeusma* and shouting to us in the Turkish language that it struck our hearts into our heels. And now it was manifest our fishermen were Turks.

At this news the master and mariners run all into holes, now again wofully whining and wringing their hands, yet no one able to advise or comfort one another. And we twelve, more daunted with their outcries than with the concerned danger from so small a vessel, shut ourselves up in the cabin, where (in the best manner

our fears and the confused noise of the Turks and our own lamentations would permit) we settled to our prayers. Meanwhile the Turks rounded us about divers times, often discharging their muskets at our sails and tacklings, viewing aloof of our strength and defence, and with perpetual clamours frightening and disanimating us, yet, daunted with the vastness of the prize, and with they knew not what concealed ambushments, they durst not venture to aboard us.

William Appleby and some others, observing the smallness of the enemy's vessel, and conceiving that if we had but courage it would be impossible for them to take us, demanded of the master what guns or other weapons of defence he had in his ship. His answer, as also that of all the rest of them, was that if it were the Lord's will they should be taken, what would weapons boot them? And if the Lord knew they should not be taken, then were they safe enough without weapons, for the Lord would be their protector. But we, never a whit satisfied with that answer, urged them whether they had any weapons or not, and we, according to our religion, would undertake the defence of our ship. Whereupon they brought us up from the keel of the ship a little barrel of gunpowder and two new muskets, that never had been used nor kept for use, but for sale when they should come to their journey's end. They were so cankered with long lying in the moist keel that it was impossible to draw forth their rammers to charge them. Wherefore demanding the master's help, and he finding them both in the same temper, without more words, but in desperate passion, threw both of them and the barrel of powder into the sea. Then giving ourselves for lost we betook us to our prayers in the best manner we were able for the time to prepare ourselves for death. And the Turks, after an hour's deliberation, discovering no arms either of offence nor defence, ventured to come aboard us.

You will partly conceive the horror and fright we were in at their entrance to us if I make a short description of the persons and demeanour of these our new masters, who for the most part were of strong and big limbs, swarthy of complexion, beards close shaven, except one little tuft on the . . .² Their doublets were much after the shape of . . . whence it was that their necks, shoulders, and breast were shamefully naked; their arms covered almost down to their elbows with a loose wide sleeve of the finest holland, the rest was naked to the hand.

² The corner of a leaf is torn away.

Since which time it hath often run in my mind whether the unseemly fashion of naked dressings amongst our vain gentlewomen of England came from the Turks to us, or from us to the Turks. But surely, whencesoever it came, the devil was both the inventor of the fashion and the messenger that brought it to us. Their breeches were as fine as their sleeves, and (as far as I could discern) were but the skirt of their shirt short at the sides and sewed together betwixt their legs, hanging loose and open at their knees. Their legs were naked, yet they had for the most part on their feet fine red Spanish leather pumps.

At their boarding us, finding no resistance, and overjoyed with the vastness of the prize, they skipped, and danced, and clipped, and hugged, and kissed one another, as if they would have expressed some mimical antic show. Some of us they first met without they bound with cords; but seeing no danger of resistance, they spared that labour in the rest, and conveyed us twelve, with four of the Hamburgers, into their own boat, to be sent to Argerès. The rest of our shipmen were left in the ship with one-half of the Turks, speedily to be conveyed to Sallee. The reason of this division was because at that time the kingdom of England had a truce with the Castle of Sallee, and consequently no subject to the King of England was saleable there; whereas at Argeres they were regarded chaffer.

This town of Argeres is famous for pirates. It lieth on the Numidian coast of the Mediterranean Sea, southward, whence it was of necessity first to pass the Straits of Cales³ . . . dtar before we could be brought thither . . . tle of Sallee belongeth to the petty kingdom of Morocco, and looketh westward towards the great ocean. But He that commands the power of the seas guided our course according to His infinite goodness, and sent us a southern wind, so contrary to our Turks' designs, that it was impossible for them to pass the gulf of the straits with us. We also prayed for a speedy passage, but our prayers were not heard, because we knew not what we asked.

Here, in daily expectation of a favourable gale, we lay at the strait's mouth from the 3rd of September, which was the day when we were taken, until the 10th of the same; during which time our lodging was but meetly in the keel of the boat, upon stones, wherewith it was ballasted, in so strait a compass by reason of the narrowness thereof that when we slept it was necessary to rest our heads and shoulders upon each other's

³ That is, Cadis. Here the corner of a leaf is lost.

legs, to the great unease both of one and other. Yet this inconvenience we thought was well recompensed with the comfort of a fuller and more savoury diet and with our fills of⁴ and water. Our table was the floor, but our table-cloth was raw hide with the hair on and the fleshy side upward, whereon we laid our butter, our cheese, our boiled rice or wheat, or fish and bread in abundance; where, when we had eaten sufficiently, all the fragments of bread or whatsoever of our superfluity was cast over into the sea; it being held amongst them a grievous contamination to eat what is left or handled by Christians. Thus so full, though coarse, was our diet, that now it seemed we were really not only in the servitude, but even in the flesh-pots of Egypt, where all the specious titles we heard were, *Arriva, cane; Abaxo, cane*; 'Up, dog;' 'Down, dog;' and for greater contempt their ordinary term in speaking to us was Christian dogs, which in their language sounds as contemptible as Mahomet, or Turk, with us. And it pleased God to give us that special grace to receive at all times a singular content, and hold it for great happiness to hear ourselves thus reviled by the Name of our Master. And to add somewhat to our miseries, our Hamburger cook, by name Court, turned informer against us, and gave notice to the Turks that we had some of us money about us; whereupon we were rifled, and not only lost the most of that little stock we had, but were also discovered (some of us) to have more shirts on than one, which were also taken from us, with all commodities whatsoever which were not necessary for the covering of our nakedness; as bands, handkerchiefs, knives, gloves, books, beads, &c. And one unhappy roguish boy, a swabber, amongst them, called Mucho (whom we were wont to call Cavalero Mucho, to humour and please him), spared not to take away some of our hats, and others' shoes, so that now we thought we might begin to say of ourselves, *Nudi nudum Christum sequimur.*" . . .

Now the 11th day of September was come, when, their provision failing them,⁵ they were constrained to make to land with

⁴ Here occurs a blank space in the MS.

⁵ Wadsworth recounts the following incident: "The wind turning contrary, we were constrained to repair to Sally. And the day before our arrival there, being destitute of victuals, the priest, called their Alfaquin, conjured the fish of the sea to draw near to the galley, so that they took them up with their hands, as many as sustained us till we arrived at Sally, where we were carried to the Castle and crammed like capons, that we might grow fatter and better for sale; and being brought to the market, were shared among them and sold" (p. 39).

all speed ; and since Sallee, whither their companions were gone before with our ship, was the nearest port of their own, thither they directed their course. But behold ! all unexpected they discover a ship in their chase upon full sail, and fearing it might be some Christian [chasing] them, they flew with sails and oars, and the more to hasten their flight they called us and our fellow Hamburgers up to help them to row. But William Appleby (a man mature both in age and judgment, and whose opinion swayed much amongst us at all times) advised us rather to hazard a little beating than discover any skill or ability in this employment. 'For,' said he, 'if our pursuers prove Christians, it were indiscretion in us to fly from them. Let them take us and welcome in God's Name ! If they prove otherwise, let us not inure our hands in this kind of service, which is the proper employment of the Turks' slaves ; for if once they perceive us able for it we shall be kept to it all our lifetimes, without hope of releasement.' This advice relished well with us, and accordingly being at each oar, two of us put to assist one Hamburger or one Turk, we so crossed his stroke, pulling towards when he put from, that they complaining of us that we were indocile and did more harm than they could do good, as unprofitable servants we were first a little swaddled with ropes' ends, and then all sent under hatches as unfit for service.

In the meantime Abdolah, their Cadis petty priest, with two or three assistants, according to their accustomed course in like accidents, was conjuring with his cross daggers, straws, and knives, and I know not what other trash, to find out who their pursuer might be. And by this means (which is familiar to all Turks and Moors) they have a great advantage against honest Christians, being able not only to discover afar off what they are, but also what they carry and of what defence they are. And most likely this act had given them encouragement to venture upon our Hamburg ship with this their small vessel. Yet some of our company, either to make themselves uneasy, or to discover of how little power the devil's inventions are against the virtue and power of God's Church, would sometimes be repeating St. John's Gospel whilst they were invoking their Mahomet gods, which so put them out of their lesson that it caused them great vexation, and sometimes jealousy over us. But at length by this art they found out that it was a Turk and friend that so followed them, who being come up to us, in a bravado our masters discharged a peal of muskets, and com-

manded their Christian dogs to come above-board to be seen, which we did very submissively, and were made a spectacle and laughter to the enemies of our faith. Then were we again shut up under hatches, where we remained quiet until we arrived at the Castle of Sallee, which was within three hours after.

At our approach to the quay of that harbour, for the greater ostentation and triumph our men discharged divers peals with their fifteen muskets, echoing them again with their two murderers, which, redoubling their report from the bordering rocks of that great ocean, made a very harmonious noise even to us twelve, as being now weary of the endless turmoils of the sea and desiring to set foot on land, though barbarian. This triumphant sound seconded with the report made before our coming, at the arrival of the bringers of our ship (namely, that in their boat they had a multitude of brave English youths, great merchants' sons, whose ransom would be worth a mass of money), drew forth Turks and Moors of both sexes and all ages to the waterside, to see and give the welcome home to that victorious boat which had sent before her so stately a prize, herself being fraught with so lovely a booty. From amongst this crew sallied forth our seven wise masters (for to so many belonged our triumphant boats), who removed us twelve into their own custody. They were all of the vulgar sort of people, and the best of them but soldiers and sharkers. Through this *amphitheatrum*, or lane of people, they brought us into the castle.

This castle (which for the bigness might rather be called a town, or city, were it not thus termed by the inhabitants) containeth in compass about thirty acres of ground, being divided, as other towns, into several streets and dwelling-houses. It is thus called in respect of the great town of Sallee, which lieth on the east side a mile distant, beyond the river, in the King of Fess his dominions; but lying low, is overlooked, and sometimes over-reached, by the great ordnance from the walls of this castle, which is situated upon a cliff of the sea, and belongeth to the kingdom of Morocco.

Whilst our masters (or, as they called them, patrons) led us from the water's side towards this castle, our hearts did even melt in our bodies with tenderness, considering in what men's hands we were fallen, and that not unlikely this was the last hour wherein we should ever more enjoy the sight and company of each other. With tears, therefore, we took our last farewell,

begging each other's prayers, pardon of offences committed in our journey, and finally, that if ever it should be any one's good hap to return into Christendom again, he who should enjoy that blessing should be mindful to acquaint the others' friends with the place and condition of their distress.

Being now entered the castle and brought into one of our patron's houses, they made their division of us, one taking one of us with one Hambugher, another two of us, another otherwise, as every one liked best, or as it fell to his lot, I know not whether. But our lot was not to go above two of us together to one house (the more was our grief), where when we came our first entertainment was very fair, and with some respect. After that manner they gave us our fill of good sweet water to drink, which was no small happiness, and not comprehensible of full-fed stomachs. Fruits (as pomegranates, hanged grapes, and the like) were plentiful. Our bread was white wheat, and every day new baked, in form of cakes, about an inch thick. Swine's flesh they abhor as abominable, but mutton and goat's flesh was very good and plentiful. A wether with us might cost a mark was sold there for five pence.

And here I may omit the manner of our eating, as well common to the masters and mistresses as to the slaves. Trenchers we saw none, knives and spoons almost out of use; whence their manner is, before they put their meat into the pot, to chop them into taxadoes (or, as we may call them, steaks), and with it good store of worts or cabbage and pimienta (a red cod of the same virtue as our black pepper), and some garlic, but no thickening, boiling the flesh so long till it fall from the bones. This they serve up in great wooden bowls, broth, meat, and cabbage together. The bowl is set upon the ground, when all that are for that mess sit them down round about it, the gentry upon a mat, the rest upon the bare earth. Into this broth every man falls to breaking his bread by morsels, so much as may suffice to drink up all the broth; then with their fingers they eat it out again, thus supplying the use of knives and spoons. Thus having dispatched their broth they come to the meat and worts at the bottom, which with their fingers they pull in pieces, being tenderly boiled and proportioned to their mouths as they see good. This, and their ridiculous manner of apparel, was the cause why that formidable and inhuman runagate pirate Captain Warde (who from a Christian turned Turk, lived many years by robberies and conjuring upon the seas, and by land by

adultery and drunkenness at Argieres), about this time lying upon his death-bed, and ready to yield forth his soul to the devil, delivered in a despairing humour this limping and barbarous epitaph to be set over his beastly corpse :

I lived like a beast, like an ape was I clad,
I fed like a swine, like an ass was I shod,
And this have I deserved for leaving my God.

Our lodging was upon the bare earth, unless by a special favour some mat or old sackcloth were lent us, which were alike the best beds our patrons had for themselves, their wives, and children, unless it were a pillow or cushion under their heads, which was not allowed us. This manner of lodging was in the beginning more tedious in regard of the moistness more than of the hardness of the earth, being for the most part in some wet kitchen or wash-house, or like out-room ; for upper rooms they had none, their houses being all flat-formed on the top with mortar and built with mud, as well for coolness in the summer-time as to save timber, which is there very scarce.

In this manner we were at first courteously entreated, according to the custom of the country, not having any employment of difficulty imposed upon us. The most was to dandle a child, to fetch in a jar of water from the well, or at the most to grind an hour sometimes at a handmill. With this easy employment, and encouraged by the favourable aspects of our patrons and patronesses, we made bold now and then to walk abroad into the streets ; where meeting now with one of our companions, then hearing of another's lodging, within three or four days we made shift all to meet and confer our business together, what means might be found to procure our ransom and return into our country, which our patrons suspecting as a thing they desired, they winked at our private meetings.

And herein we first made use of the counsel of some English and Irish slaves, and also of some "Renegados" that wished us well for country's sake, who gave us information that no Englishman might at that time be bought or sold at Sallee, James, then King of England (whose subjects we were), having truce for some years with that castle. Others were found of our nation who out of malice to our religion, informed against us that we were no subjects to the King of England, but Romish Papists, and consequently enemies to our King and country. Others

went about to prove us Irishmen, which might, notwithstanding this truce, be bought and sold ; wherein some of us were sorely pressed to prove our country ; amongst whom I escaped narrowly, being judged by my person, complexion, and favour much to resemble the natives of Ireland.

In these difficulties from our own countrymen, more cruel to us than Turks, we procured means to make our cause known to a counsellor-at-law that spoke the Spanish tongue, whom, according to his office amongst them, they called Scrivano. He in his youth had been brought up amongst Christians, and at such time as the Moors were last banished out of Spain, was with many others brought to Saltee ; a captain of sweet nature and of courteous Christian-like behaviour towards strangers. This Scrivano proffered to make it appear before the Santon (or Governor of the Castle) that we were Englishmen, true subjects of the King of England, and that if we were bought or sold we had great wrong done us, besides the breach of truce which would follow betwixt them and England. The day therefore being appointed for the hearing our cause, our patrons had warning given them, and our witnesses were provided.

This day hearing was held in an outward court before the Santon's house, where, after we had stood awhile expecting, came forth the Santon, with about four or five of his grave assistants clad in their robes of cloth. On their heads they wore chasses, which is a long red cap, wreathed about their temples, with bands (or rather scarves) of different colours. Their heads were shaven to the skull, one only tuft left in the midst of their crown whereby Mahomet may pull them up to Heaven to him. Their beards are likewise shaven to the skin, the upper lip only preserved, of a large length. Next their bodies they wear pure fine linen, over it a scarlet jump, reaching almost down to their knees, garnished before most commonly with frogs and loops, and girt about their middle with a parti-coloured scarf or towel. Their arms from their elbows were partly covered with the loose wide sleeves of their shirt, as also their knees and their hams with their furred white drawers. Their necks and legs were naked ; on their feet they wore red leather pumps. Over the one shoulder they cast a piece of white flannel of four or five ells long, which they either wound twice or thrice about their middle, or carelessly threw it over both shoulders and let it trail on the ground behind them.

In this array (which is also used by all the better sort) they

sat them down to hear our cause, not in chairs or upon the bench, as with us, but cowering upon their heels and resting their shoulders upon the wall. Where, by the testimony of those that heard us speak English and understood us, and by what our Hamburgers could say for us, and no less by wit and understanding of our Scrivano, we were all quit, and passed not only for Englishmen, but for true subjects of the King of England; and in conclusion were found not slaves, but at the most captives or prisoners, and might not therefore be bought or sold, but well compelled to ransom ourselves, if we were able.

Our patrons were not well pleased with this order; but not knowing how to remedy it, took this most devilish device of some ill-willer, to send and give us as a free gift and present to their King at Morocco. This news troubled us not a little; but when we came truly to understand the nature and intent of this our preferment (to wit, that the greater part of us, being youths and fair-skinned above the natives of the country, we were to be made eunuchs, to wait upon the King's concubines in their chamber, according to the custom of the country, when, besides the imminent danger of our soul's health, we understood that no money would be then taken for our ransom) it is incredible to believe how we were frighted. No sleep would close our eyes, nor ground contain our feet. We often confer together. We part from one counsellor to another, who all advised us that the surest way to prevent this danger was speedily to ransom ourselves, and not to refuse any rates that should be exacted of us.

In this almost desperate case we thought no time to be neglected nor charges to be spared in the preventing this infernal plot against us. Wherefore appointing a meeting, we conferred together with our patrons about our ransom and return to Europe; and in the end made this agreement with them, to give them the sum of a thousand Barbary ducats, or in English account three hundred pounds, which was after the rate of twenty-five pounds a man. For the procuring this money, eight of our company are to depart for Spain with the first opportunity, and the other four to remain as pledges until the money should come for all together."

Wadsworth's account of his own personal experiences from the period of their landing at Sallee is well worthy of being appended. He proceeds thus:

"Being divided to several masters, we took farewell one of another, with tears in our eyes, never thinking to meet any more. The price that was given for each of us was twenty-five pounds, more or less; our masters being Moriscos, which dwelt at the Castle. The Hamburgers likewise were sold in like manner; but in this respect were in far worse estate, because they were sold to Moors in that country, and therefore had less hopes of future redemption. But amongst the rest of our company I deemed myself the happiest, because I fell to the captain of the ship, whose name was Alligalan, a Morisco, who had been banished with one hundred thousand more from Spain by Philip the Third upon suspicion or treason. These Moriscos came into Spain with Jacob Almansor, otherwise called Vlidor Caliph, who conquered Spain and brought them in with him, where they resided five hundred years, until the last extirpation, as now said.

This Morisco carried me to his house, where fettering one of my legs with an iron chain and clothing me with a canvas suit, laid these injunctions on me. First, he gave me charge of his stable, and then to grind at his handmill, and to draw water at the fountain, with many others of like nature.

The victuals he gave me were berengenaes,⁶ cabbage, and goats' flesh. As for my lodging, it was in a dungeon in the market-place, where they use commonly to lodge their slaves, who repair there every night about eight of the clock, their masters manacled their hands before, for fear they should make an insurrection, the number of them being about eight hundred, being Spaniards, Frenchmen, English, Italians, Portugals, and Flemish. Our beds were nothing but rotten straw laid on the ground, and our coverlets pieces of old sails, full of millions of lice and fleas, so that we could take no rest; being constrained to put back to back and rub out the pain. About five of the clock in the morning, the door being opened, we repaired to our master's house, and so to our wonted work."

The narrative will be continued in our next number.

JOSEPH STEVENSON.

⁶ "This Berengenaes is like our turnips" (note in original).

Bishop Challoner.

THE times, life, and work of Bishop Richard Challoner, Vicar Apostolic of the London District from 1740 to 1781, and Bishop of Debra *in partibus infidelium*, form the subject of the present paper.

Challoner was the son of a Dissenter, a wine-cooper, at Lewes, in Sussex. He was born in 1691, only two years after the great Revolution, which dashed to the ground so many high-raised hopes, and sequestered English Catholics for more than a century from the public life of their country. He died in 1781, rather more than two years after Sir George Savile's Act had introduced the first relaxation of the penal laws. Over this whole period of deep humiliation extended this long and well-spent life.

The condition of things created by or soon after the Revolution for Catholics may be thus briefly described. Two new penal laws—inflicting, however, penalties short of death—were passed under William the Third, in addition to the persecuting and disenabling statutes of former reigns. By the Act of Settlement, passed in 1701, the line of succession to the throne was changed, and Protestantism was made an essential condition of kingship in England. Moreover, every Catholic land-owner was double-taxed, forbidden to come near the Court, and not allowed to ride a horse of greater value than five pounds. At the Revolution itself chapels were pulled down and schools dispersed; and we are told that ten Jesuit colleges “vanished in the confusion of the times.”

Yet from this very year, so full of disaster, dated a measure of real ecclesiastical progress—a forward step which has never since been lost. In 1688 a plan was matured for dividing England into four ecclesiastical districts, with a Vicar Apostolic over each. The relief given to Catholics by this arrangement—removing as it did the uncertainty and variation which, owing to the misfortunes of the times, had characterized their ecclesiastical government since the Reformation, was great and permanent. The first four Vicars Apostolic, whose names

were, Leyburn, Giffard, Smith, and Ellis, were men of great piety, patience, and firmness. This arrangement worked exceedingly well, and was only superseded in 1850¹—when a regular Hierarchy was restored to us—because it had done its work, and was no longer sufficient for the administration of an enlarged and unmolested community. On the whole, though the Revolution closed all public life against English Catholics, it did them little other harm, and in some respects it ushered in a happier era. For a long time the penal laws were left unexecuted; the increasing mildness of manners, in which England merely shared in the general advance of Europe, warranted Catholics in dismissing actual fear for their lives, and with prudence and quietness there was little difficulty in obtaining religious ministrations, and that with a regularity and certainty which till the institution of the Vicars Apostolic had not existed.

Challoner was born, as we said, in 1691. His father died when he was very young, and his mother soon afterwards became a Catholic. There are different statements as to the conversion of Challoner himself. Barnard, his biographer, attributes it to Gother, a well-known Catholic writer. Bishop Milner, however, tells us, that through his mother's care he was received very young into some Catholic household, and was already converted when he met Gother at Warkworth. However, this may be, it is certain that that venerable man discerned in him the foundation of a strong and noble character, and an understanding of no common force; and finding also in the boy a readiness to devote himself unreservedly to the Divine service, he sent him, in 1704, to the English College at Douay to be educated. His biographers tell us how he passed in eight years through a course of study which most students only accomplished in twelve, how he exchanged the position of a student for that of a teacher, and rose step by step in the College till, in 1720, he became its Vice-President, receiving some years later the degree of Doctor in Theology from the University of Douay. In 1730 he came over to England, and laboured as an active priest on the mission under Bishop Petre in the London District for ten years. It was during this period that he wrote the effective reply to Middleton, of which more will be said when we come to treat of his writings. In

¹ To be more exact,—the number of the Vicars Apostolic was increased in 1840 from four to eight, and it was this revised arrangement that was superseded by the new Hierarchy.

1740, after a protracted contest between Dr. Petre, who wished to have him for his coadjutor, and the College at Douay, which wanted him for its president, Rome decided for the former, and he was consecrated Bishop of Debra early in 1741.

The episcopate thus commenced was continued for the space of forty years; and it would be not in accordance with the object which we have in view, and moreover difficult, on account of the paucity of documents, to attempt a detailed and continuous narrative of the events which befel the diocese under his pastoral care. What we have to say may, without regard to the exact order of time, be fitly arranged under five heads. First, we shall consider Challoner as a man, secondly as a writer, thirdly as a bishop. In the fourth place, we shall speak of the many afflictions and persecutions which he endured. Lastly, we shall give a few words to the alarming and harassing incidents of the summer preceding his death—I refer to the riots of 1780—and show how soon, after these were over, he sank to rest in our Lord, full of years, in unfailing peace, and unfaltering hope.

1. Challoner's manner of life was regular, and marked by unceasing activity. He rose at six winter and summer; after an hour's meditation, he said his Mass at eight, preaching always on Sundays and holidays; his mornings were taken up with correspondence, business of various kinds, writing and reading, all seasoned with continual prayer. At two he dined with his chaplains, and his cheerfulness and even gaiety at such times were never at fault. In the afternoon he visited the houses of those whom he wished to see; returning home between five and six, he was ready to see any one who called on him, and these interviews often lasted long; at nine he supped; then prayers, examen of conscience, and sleep. He preferred living in lodgings to having a house of his own; partly, no doubt, because he could oftener change his quarters, and thus baffle the spies and informers who were always dogging his footsteps, but chiefly, it is said, because he so lived at less expense, and had therefore more to give to the poor. If it be asked what manner of man he was outwardly, a medallion likeness prefixed to one of his works² will help us to answer the question. In this picture he is represented in a wig and bands, with a cross hanging round his neck. He was above the middle height; his features were regular, and wore a mild, yet withal a very firm expression; on his even forehead

² *The Grounds of the Old Religion*, reprinted by Milner in 1798.

there seems to rest a fixed look, not exactly of anxiety, but of apprehensiveness, originating probably in the painful sense of insecurity which the iniquitous penal laws produced, engendering at the same time among Catholics themselves a fatal crop of scandals and lapses, which, though often, were not always repaired.³ It is true that for every such lapse he was rewarded by many conversions. Speaking of his work on the mission between 1730 and 1740, Milner says: "Innumerable were the conversions which he wrought," and we cannot doubt that his success in this direction was not less after he became a bishop.

2. As a writer, Challoner was indefatigable; the list of his works, large and small, reaches to forty or fifty. Milner justly says that, casting the eye over this list, and observing with what care many of his works were written, one who knew him not might have supposed that all his time and thoughts were given to the preparation and composition of books. But, in truth, with him a book partook largely of the nature of an action; the better instruction of his flock, or their defence against the attacks showered down upon them in those dark times, was usually his motive for writing. Among the books which the thought of instruction produced we may name the *Garden of the Soul*, with its beautiful second title, which, so far as I know, was Challoner's own conception, "A Manual for the use of Christians who, living in the world, aspire to devotion." The same motive led to the publication of *Think Well On't; Reflections on the Great Truths of Eternity; Meditations for Each Day in the Year; Britannia Sancta*; the *Lives of the Fathers of the Desert*, and several translations made from the works of St. Augustine, St. Francis de Sales, and the Père Boudon. Those works which had a defensive aim were perhaps still more numerous. His invaluable *Memoirs of Missionary Priests* arose out of a desire to oppose authentic narratives of the sufferings and deaths of the true English martyrs to that monstrous collection of falsehoods, old wives' fables, and garbled or misinterpreted records, which goes by the names of *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*. Of this book a cheap reprint was put in circulation about 1740; for some people, then as now, seemed to think they could never do enough to inflame the popular hatred against the old religion. Challoner's reply, the *Memoirs, &c.*, appeared in 1742. It was of course only indirectly an answer to Foxe; the direct unmasking of that scandalous writer was reserved

³ Milner mentions several instances of both kinds, which were a source of continual grief and pain to the Bishop.

for one of his own co-religionists, Canon Maitland, writing just a hundred years after Challoner.

Again, when the excitement occasioned by the preaching of the early Methodists was at its height, when their chapels could not hold the multitudes of devotees who flocked into them, when the words, faith, grace, conversion, assurance, illumination, conviction of sin, were on every one's lips, and strange spiritual experiences formed the common subject of conversation with high and low, it was not wonderful that the good Bishop thought it right to address to his flock some seasonable words of warning. Accordingly he wrote, *A Caveat against the Methodists, showing how unsafe it is for any Christian to join himself to their society, or to adhere to their teachers.*

But of all his controversial writings, the most celebrated is his short reply⁴ to Dr. Conyers Middleton (a well-known Cambridge divine of that day, and the translator of Cicero), who in a pamphlet called *A Letter from Rome*, had endeavoured to prove that a large portion of the ritual used in the churches of modern Rome was borrowed from the temple-worship of the ancient Romans—in short, that Roman Christianity was Paganism under a new name. Any classical scholar who is familiar with the poetry of Virgil and Ovid, with their profuse details about images, and lustral water, and processions, and festivals, and votive offerings, and the like, knows how easy such a line of argument is, and also how futile it is. There is no reason why ceremonies, in themselves neither good nor bad, which have been misused in the service of a false religion, should not be used with edification and profit when transferred with due care into the ritual of the true religion. "What seemed an idol hymn," as Keble finely says—

What seemed an idol hymn now breathes of Thee,
Tuned by faith's ear to some celestial harmony.

Being utterly ignorant of the religion of modern Rome, Middleton might perhaps in good faith attribute more importance to the external resemblances to Pagan rites which he observed than of right belonged to them. At any rate Challoner has little difficulty in disposing of all his cavils, and after doing so, he with much wit and ingenuity turns the tables upon his adversary, imagining a Deist to be arguing that the Church of England and Popery, on account of the numerous resemblances between the two, are in fact identical, a conclusion just

⁴ Printed as a Preface to *The Catholic Christian Instructed*, which is a sort of larger catechism.

as valid and just as logical in the one case, as Middleton's argument for the identity of Catholicism and Paganism was in the other. It was probably this part of the reply which nettled Middleton to such a degree as to induce him to take steps for putting the penal laws in operation against the writer, who thereupon, warned in time, retired to the Continent. This controversy took place in 1737.

3. Time will not permit me to say as much as I should wish about Challoner's episcopal work.⁵ In his relations to the State he was prudent and cautious; and though many of those whom he best loved were Jacobites, he kept aloof from all complications arising on that score, and even dissuaded a Catholic gentleman of the south of England from his purpose, when, in the '45, he told the Bishop that he meant to arm all his tenants, and go at their head to join the Pretender. To his clergy he was a father and a friend; he first called them together in periodical conferences, and trained by degrees, says Milner, "a body of clergy ready to do anything and to go anywhere for God." But he could be stern and inflexibly severe when any of his young clerics, or any foreign priest residing in England, gave in to what Milner calls "the profane novelties of the times." This leads me to speak of the case of the Père Courayer, who during nearly the whole of Challoner's episcopate was residing in or near London, and must have caused the Bishop grief and pain unspeakable.

Father Courayer was the Père Hyacinthe of the eighteenth century. Both revolted against the Holy See, and refused to hearken to the voice of the teaching Church; both, after thus acting, insisted that they were still Catholics—that they were in the right, and all who had condemned them were wrong. Of both alike we may say with St. Augustine, "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*," without a misgiving the whole world passes judgment upon them. Courayer, a Regular Canon of Ste. Geneviève, at Paris, who seems to have had an over-legal quibbling turn of mind, fell in with some of the controversial works of Anglican divines in the seventeenth century, and being convinced by them, wrote a book (1723) in which he defended the validity of Anglican Orders, and maintained that the Church of England possessed a true Apostolical succession. Enchanted at receiving aid from such a quarter, the University of Oxford sent him a Doctor's degree, and Wake, then Archbishop of Canterbury, addressed flattering letters to him. But

⁵ This paper was read as an afternoon lecture to a Catholic society.

his book was condemned by a Synod of twenty-two Bishops in France, and the theory which it upheld was declared by the Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, to be "false, scandalous, injurious to the Church and to the Holy See." Finally, if a statement of Charles Butler⁶ may be relied upon, it was condemned by a Bull of Pope Benedict the Fourteenth. Far from submitting, Courayer wrote a voluminous defence of his first work, and in 1728 he passed over to England. The Anglicans, as might be expected, received him with open arms. Queen Caroline distinguished him by many favours, and obtained for him the grant of an ample pension. A canonry of Christ Church was conferred upon him, and he received other preferment. All this time he professed to be still a Catholic, and though, when in the country, he used to attend the parish churches, when in London he went regularly to Mass. He used frequently, says Milner, to go up to the altar rail for Communion. And here another point of similarity to the catastrophe of the Père Hyacinthe strikes me. We all remember how last year the ex-Carmelite, wrote publicly to the Archbishop of Paris, informing him that he had opened a place of schismatical worship. We remember, too, the stern and majestic reply of the Archbishop, telling his correspondent that he was an excommunicated person, and had nothing to do, until he repented, with the Catholic Church. Not less firm was the attitude of Challoner towards the unrepentant Courayer. Although, as has been mentioned, the latter often came up to the rails for Communion, the Bishop ordered that the officiating priest, in every such case, should pass him by, and not communicate him.

Outwardly, nothing could be more prosperous than Courayer's life. But he could not escape the operation of that law of the spiritual creation, under which none that break away from the Catholic Church can remain abidingly in one stay. Not to speak of his edition of Father Paul Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent*, in the notes to which he improves on the malignant commentaries of the false monk, a kind of literary testament, published a few years after his death, showed that he had added to his former errors on the Holy See and the Church grave heresies concerning the Trinity and Incarnation. In this condition of mind he appears to have died. Let us hope that the Père Hyacinthe may come to a less mournful end.

4. Such were some of the afflictions which the Bishop had

⁶ Butler's *Additions to Historical Memoirs*, iv. 277.

to sustain at the hands of false brethren. We now come to the troubles which came upon him from those who were without. We have seen that the severe laws passed under William the Third remained for a long while dormant; but a time came, after the middle of the century, when greedy informers appeared to press home that portion of the Acts which bore against the clergy, and treacherous relatives took advantage of the clauses which bore against the laity. The Act under which nearly all this mischief was effected was the 2 Will. III. ch. 4 (1699), intitled, "An Act for the further preventing the growth of Popery." This year is included in the history of Lord Macaulay, which terminates in the spring of 1700; and you might naturally suppose that he would not lose this great opportunity of exposing the inconsistency of politicians, and deploring that the same party which by the Toleration Act had broken the bonds of the Dissenter, by this Act of 1699 had forged fresh shackles for the innocent Catholics. This expectation would be natural, but if you turn to the book, you will look in vain. There is not one word on the subject. I will not attempt to account for this singularly convenient omission, but will go on to describe the Act. It was of a two-fold character; it had, so to speak, two blades, on one of which it transfixed the bishops and clergy, on the other the laity. Any informer indicting a bishop or priest for saying Mass, and prosecuting him to a conviction, was entitled to receive a reward of £100 from the Sheriff of the county in which the case was tried. This was the blade for the clergy; for the laity the same Act provided a disgraceful machinery aiming to disinherit Catholic land-owners and to transfer their estate to the next of kin, being, or becoming Protestant. A peculiarly infamous clause promised the assistance of the Court of Chancery to the Protestant children of Catholic land-owners, who might find any difficulty in getting a sufficient maintenance out of their parents. But upon this side of the troubles of Catholics, as not directly connected with the life of Challoner, I shall say no more. The clauses bearing against the clergy began to be put in force in 1765 by a notorious informer, whom Milner calls "Carpenter Payne." For thirteen years from that date, *i.e.*, till the passing of Sir George Savile's Act, this man was a thorn in the side of the Bishop, and a terror to many a hard-working priest, who found himself liable to be seized at the altar, dragged away before a magistrate, compelled to find bail, and then to plead at the Sessions to an indictment, in which the penalty on conviction was perpetual

imprisonment. There was not one week perhaps during the first seven years of that time, says Milner, in which some fresh misfortune, generally caused by the incessant activity of this one informer, did not come to the Bishop's ears. He himself, with five others, was at one time the object of a prosecution, and had to find bail. Fortunately it was discovered that the informer, to save himself expense, had forged some subpœnas which he had served on various persons; and it seems that, finding this had come to the knowledge of the Catholics, Payne offered to drop the prosecutions against the Bishop and his five friends, on condition that his own illegal act were over-looked. This compromise was accepted. But in the case of the Rev. J. B. Malony, who unwarily admitted himself to be a priest, the indictment succeeded; Malony was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment, and Payne obtained his £100 from the Sheriff of Middlesex. His labours do not appear to have been crowned with final success in any other instance. Lord Mansfield, before whom several priests were brought, evidently sympathized with the accused; and he told the juries that it was not enough that the informer had seen the accused saying Mass, or what he believed to be Mass, but that he must also bring legal proof that he was a Catholic priest within the meaning of the statute. Upon this point the prosecutions always broke down; the full legal proof of priesthood could not be obtained. Consequently, although much mischief was done, though "several chapels were shut up, the priests scattered, and Mass and preaching interrupted," the frequency of the prosecutions gradually diminished on account of their ill-success, until Sir George Savile's Act in 1778 put an end to them by repealing the legislation out of which they grew.

5. In conclusion, I have to say a few words on the riots of 1780, which were shortly after followed by the Bishop's holy death. These disturbances were directly caused by the anti-Catholic bigotry of the Methodists, with Wesley at their head, in whom the spectacle of thousands of Catholics coming up to London to take the new oath of allegiance, as prescribed by the Act of 1778, seems to have caused a violent access of the *odium theologicum*. Wesley and his followers formed a Protestant Association, which began to hold meetings in every part of London. Lord George Gordon now threw himself into the movement, and by public advertisement notified to all good Protestants that, as no hall could hold forty thousand men, the Association would meet on Friday, the 2nd of June, in

St. George's Fields, all wearing blue cockades, and proceed to consider of the way of presenting their petition (which was for the repeal of the Act of 1778) to Parliament. This monster meeting was held accordingly, and was the commencement of the riots, during which London was for five days in the hands of the mob. Those scenes have been often described; they culminated on the night of Wednesday, the 7th of June, when Newgate, the King's Bench Prison, and the Fleet, were all in flames, and to one looking down on London from Highgate Hill, thirty-six conflagrations were visible at once. By this time all the Catholic chapels in London had been destroyed, and the houses of Catholics in all parts of the city and the suburbs had been burnt and wrecked. The aged Bishop was happily withdrawn from the fury of the mob. "It is known," says Milner, "to have been the intention" of the leaders, if they had found him, "to chair him in mockery, and to carry him about on their frantic expeditions." It was not his own wish to leave his house; however he yielded to the earnest entreaties of his clergy, and took refuge in the house of a friend at Highgate, where he was secreted till the riots were over. He outlived by six months these events, but the shock which they caused to his aged frame, grief for the sacrileges, the terror, the losses, the destructions of that miserable time, the sense that the London mission had, so far as material works and aids were concerned, to be founded afresh, weighed heavily upon him, and made him long for the rest of the grave, and the rewards promised to the *servus bonus et fidelis*. The end soon came. He had received Holy Communion on the morning of Wednesday, January 10, 1781; at his mid-day meal he had a paralytic seizure, which, leaving his mind clear, stopped his utterance; he received Extreme Unction, and on Friday he died. Happy life! happy death! His countrymen knew not what a treasure they had possessed in him, what a treasure they lost in him. Relatively to the noisy public life in England, his death was as obscure as his life had been; but it is safe to predict that when the names of Middleton, Wake, Atterbury, Beveridge, Howley, and the rest are all forgotten, that of Challoner will impress itself with a revived dearness on the hearts of Englishmen; they will deplore the blindness and injustice of their forefathers, and say: "There was one standing among them in the eighteenth century whom they knew not."

THOMAS ARNOLD.

*Pope Honorius.*¹

THIS pamphlet is put forward as "the results of an investigation into the case of Honorius," and is stated to be published out of no love of controversy, but for the sake of "the truth and peace." We have no wish to question Mr. Willis's motives, though doubtless the peculiar position of Cuddesdon College just at present may render a diversion of this kind especially convenient. The expedient of casting dirt at others while you are being yourself pelted is a very old one; and then the case of Pope Honorius is such a tempting field for virtuous declamation against the wicked pretensions of the Catholic Church. Besides, gentle inspirations may have come from certain high quarters suggesting that local circumstances call for a little diversion into the wide field of the Roman Question as a thing altogether desirable and perhaps necessary for the present times. Still, as we have said, we give Mr. Willis full credit for his desire to seek after the truth and peace, but we fear he will contribute very little towards the attainment of those great Gospel blessings by the publication of his pamphlet. The false statement contained in the second sentence of Mr. Willis's Preface, on the contrary, renders such attainment hopeless. "History," he says, "clearly shows that the unprimitive and un-Catholic doctrine of the Papal Supremacy has been the great disturber of the peace and unity of Christendom."

Consistently with this statement Mr. Willis complains, adopting the words of an anonymous writer for the purpose, that the truth of the Divine institution of the Papal Supremacy, as the one guarantee of unity and truth, is unceasingly pressed upon Protestants and Orientals by Latin controversialists, who are never tired of proclaiming that "unity cannot possibly exist without the Papacy; that if its power is not acknowledged Christianity must inevitably fall to pieces and

¹ *The New Roman Dogma.* By the Rev. E. F. Willis, M.A., Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College.

disappear." Well, the fact is at once admitted. Certainly Catholics do earnestly and unanimously persist in these assertions, and how do Mr. Willis and his anonymous friend meet them? By words such as these—

Surely these ingenious reasoners, in their anxiety to uphold the Papacy, seem to have omitted one main factor in their calculation. *They have forgotten the existence of God.* They suppose, apparently, that God has not the power of maintaining unity in His Church, unless in the particular mode and by the particular means which appear to their judgment to be requisite. Has not God the power to accomplish whatever He wills in His own way? Are we bound to define for Him the particular path which He must trace in order to preserve and maintain His Church?

To this we reply that in no sense do Catholics pretend to define for themselves, far less for God, the particular means of preserving unity and truth in the Church; they content themselves with acknowledging the path that He Himself has traced for that high purpose, and, as a proof that they are right in their view, they appeal to the existing state of the world, and they further ask that, if the particular mode that they recognize as the Divine mode of preserving and maintaining the Church be not Divine, the way that God really wills should be pointed out to them.

Mr. Willis will admit that the maintenance of truth and unity in Christian times is an object contemplated in the Divine counsels; the question therefore arises, how has that object been realized in history? Is it in any way realized in the times in which we live? In reply to these questions it is stated by Catholics, as a simple matter of fact, that there does exist a great communion that, even by the admission of those most keenly opposed to it, represents a traditional system that runs so far back into the depths of antiquity that no one can precisely point out its origin in any period short of Apostolic times; that this great communion, under the name of the Catholic Church, does also now actually claim, and always has claimed, to possess the truth of Jesus Christ, to teach, and to have taught with unvarying harmony even from the very beginning that same Divine truth; and moreover to be, in and by her wonderful organization, the divinely appointed means of preserving and handing it on to the end of time. And, as a matter of fact, practically the Roman unity is the outcome of this claim—a unity more wonderful than the unity of the old

Roman world, for the latter manifested itself in civil form under the strong hand of imperial rule with almost infinite variety of philosophical opinion and religious belief and practice, while the former shows itself under the converse shape of marvellous harmony of belief and practice, subsisting under every variety and change of civil government. Two hundred millions of men, of every race under heaven, maintaining a living union and unity under such conditions, is a fact that cannot be overlooked or put aside.

On the other hand, what have we on the outside of this world-wide Church? There are large numbers of men, it is true, outside the pale of the Roman Church who call themselves Christians, but is there unity in any sense amongst them? The answer to this question is furnished by sects multiplied even to infinitesimal division, with innumerable differences of views and opinions, which cannot be dignified by the name of beliefs, and abjuring all outward communion even with one another, and much more with the Catholic Church. Then, too, when we inspect the internal condition of any of these sects, we find unity conspicuous by its absence. It is unnecessary to do more than refer to the sectional character of Eastern Christianity, in which any pretension to unity on the part of isolated communities can only be compared to the unity of the dead branch or dry bone. Nor is it otherwise with the great pretender to the prerogatives of the Catholic Church, the Anglican Communion. To say that unity of any kind or form subsists within it can only provoke a smile. Such unity as it does possess is that of the bundle of faggots kept together by the restraining cord, the cord that performs this charitable function on its behalf being the tender solicitude of the civil power, and her Majesty's House of Commons.

Now we would ask Mr. Willis and his anonymous friend to look their position fairly in the face, and then honestly to ask themselves which of the two has most "forgotten the existence of God," they themselves or the Roman Catholic Church? The Catholic Church recognizes the working of the living Spirit of God as the sole source and preserver of her living and majestic unity; while, on the other hand, we may ask to what does Mr. Willis attribute—to confine ourselves to that—the actual condition of the Anglican Church? To which of God's ways may we venture to trace it? God certainly has "the power of maintaining unity in His Church," but judging from the state

of things in the Establishment, it would seem to come to this, either that His power has failed on her behalf, or that He has not willed that her unity should in any real sense be maintained. Mr. Willis is welcome to either horn of the dilemma.

Mr. Willis's anonymous friend next appeals to matters of fact. His appeal leads to this conclusion : that, whatever may be said concerning the utility of the Chair of Peter in certain ages before it was deified, (and that it even in those times had its utility is a matter of fact which he does not deny,) in after times when the Divine right of the Papal Supremacy had been put forth, the Chair of Peter, so far from being the centre of unity, became, on the contrary, the great source of the multiplied divisions that have in the course of centuries rent the world. This writer does not say when the claim of the Divine institution of the Papacy was first advanced. It would be well for him to try to do so ; perhaps the attempt might lead him to recognize the fact that the only ground of the utility of the institution in early times was that very Divine right which is now in his eyes such a rock of offence.

But as he views it at present, the Divine centre of unity has been the origin of every evil that has in connection with religion afflicted the world. Had it not been for the recognition of this Divine centre, the desperate struggle between the spiritual and temporal power in the middle ages would never have taken place ; nor would Gallicanism and its strong opposition to the Papacy ever have been heard of. The Waldenses, Albigenses, Wickliffites, and Hussites would not have taken the attitude they did ; the Reformation would never have troubled the world and rent Western Christendom in twain ; Jansenism would not have excited disturbance, it would have been more moderate, and so forth. " Had not the belief in a Divine centre of unity been invented, these results would never have happened." Perhaps not ; but the result would have been the enslavement of Christ's appointed organ of truth to the temporal powers of the world, and the disappearance of anything like definite religious teaching, for which the sole substitute would have been such teaching as commended itself to the ever-varying fluctuations of popular assemblies, or to the arbitrary conceits of Sovereigns of the type of the Russian Czar. The final outcome of any system, or rather no system, from which Divine institution and Divine guidance were absent, would have been the universal spread of a sort of Pan-Anglicanism, something like,

though exaggerated perhaps in form, the Anglicanism of which we have had experience in this country for the last three centuries, and the final development of which is working itself out in all its feebleness and deformity of shattered features actually before our eyes. Do Mr. Willis and his friend contemplate such a result with satisfaction and approbation? Is Anglicanism such a bed of roses that they would deliberately offer it for the repose of the weary world, instead of that great Roman unity and peace which they would blindly overturn and destroy? Besides, to be logical, they must carry out their principle to the full. Popes and Councils, even before the supposed invention of the Divine centre, used no other principle of government than Popes and Councils after its recognition. Anathema was said to Arius and Nestorius and Eutyches, just as it has been subsequently said to Huss and Wickliffe and Luther and Calvin; and as it would now be said to Döllinger and Pusey and Liddon, if it were thought worth the while. But if the principle were evil in one case, it could not be good in the other; and the sole result of its abandonment would be to give full scope to the working of the contrary principle and to make it of universal application. One effect of this alone could follow, that the Catholic Church in every age must have taken the form of an enlarged Anglican Establishment, while the ultimate outcome of its evolution of eighteen centuries would be a conglomerate formation, in which the names of Pusey and Liddon and Stanley and Jowett and Close and Sumner and Simeon and Maurice and Hoadley and Tillotson and Laud and Williams and Grindal and the illustrious Cranmer would be held up to the veneration of mankind in common with those of Simon Magus and Cerinthus and Paul of Samosata, and Arius and Nestorius and Eutyches, and Donatus and Pelagius and Luther and Calvin and Zwingle, and Brown and John Fox, and Wesley and Joe Smith, and in short every fanatic who has ever had sufficient force of character to make himself a rallying point for spirits kindred to, but weaker than himself. The living unity of the Catholic Church resting on the voice of Peter and that of nineteen General Councils, is the practical protest against the unlovely and unwholesome theoretical bubble that the disturbed imaginations of Mr. Willis and his friend have conjured up.

There is another point in Mr. Willis's Preface that deserves not so much notice as reprobation. The old common-places of Protestant controversy are reproduced with the usual unblushing

assurance with which they are ever presented to the public when occasion requires, and with some considerable exaggeration of the bad language in which they are always certain to be emphasized. The Forged Decretals, of course, play their part; just as if it had not been a hundred times admitted by Catholic writers that the Decretals were forged, as far, at least, as their form is concerned; but that in any case the claims of the Catholic Church and the Chair of Peter in no way rest upon them.

Then again, equally of course, the old story of the denouncement by St. Gregory the Great of the title of "Universal Bishop" is brought on to the stage, just as if St. Gregory had never asserted, as strongly as any of his predecessors or successors, his possession, as St. Peter's Successor, of supremacy over the whole Church. Among his predecessors, St. Siricius declares that "he had been intrusted with the care of all the Churches:" St. Innocent the First claims to be the "head and apex of the episcopate:" St. Zosimus says that "no one might venture to question the judgment of the Apostolic See:" St. Boniface the First, that "the care of the Universal Church was intrusted to the Roman See:" and as to the purport of the statements of the Great St. Leo there can be no question.

St. Gregory the Great hands down the tradition of the Roman Church in terms no less forcible and explicit than those used by his predecessors. In many places in his letters he gives his testimony to this fundamental dogma of the Gospel, that Peter rules in the person of his Successors over the Universal Church. He says that "the Apostolic See is the Head of all the Churches;" that "a charge has been laid on him of watching over all the Churches;" that "if a fault is found in bishops, there is not one of them who is not subject to the Apostolic See;" that "the care and principdom of the whole Church is committed to Peter;" and that "Peter, in the person of his Successors, was still living in the Roman See." And he acts as well as writes. To John, the Patriarch of Constantinople, he declares, with reference to this very matter of "Universal Bishop," that if persuasion will not avail, he must have recourse to other measures, "for when a wound cannot be healed by gentle handling, we must have recourse to the knife." Notwithstanding John's pretentious claims to the title of Universal Bishop, and Pope Gregory's rejection of the same, even the Patriarch of Constantinople must be made to feel that there

was one who could command and enforce obedience ; that, in fact, Peter still lived and spoke in Gregory, the Patriarch of Old Rome, and still more, the Supreme Head of the Church. In a word, what St. Gregory rejected and condemned, was the notion that the title of Universal Bishop might mean that he, or any one bearing that title, was the sole bishop of every diocese ; that the Papacy alone, and not the Episcopate also, was of Divine institution. This proposition is simply heretical. But in making this declaration, St. Gregory never for a moment dreamt of ignoring the supreme power that he had received from God over the Universal Church. To have denied the existence of this power would have been as heretical as to uphold the proposition that he condemned.

One more protest we must make, and that of a graver kind. In the course of his onslaught on Papal Infallibility, Mr. Willis invokes the help and quotes "the words of a devout son of the Catholic Church." Happily for the writer in question, he was a devout son of the Catholic Church, actuated by a very different spirit to that which inspires Mr. Willis's impulsive energies. He proved his devotion to the Catholic Church by a noble acceptance of her teaching, and not by a continuance in the perversities of his own unassisted intelligence. Father Gratry—for he it is of whom Mr. Willis speaks—was, as every one knows, an earnest opponent of the definition of the Pope's Infallibility while the question was yet open to discussion, and wrote some strong, nay, violent letters in support of his views. One who knew Father Gratry well, and lived in the most intimate relations with him, thus explains the motives by which he was induced to take the course he did, and also gives his estimate of Father Gratry's capacity for dealing with so grave and important a question. After speaking of the good Father's simplicity and docility of character, our informant proceeds as follows : "How, then, explain the letters of the Father against the projected decree on the Infallibility of the Pope?" It is very simple : the good Father, who was much less of a theologian than of a philosopher, suffered himself to be influenced by persons in whom he had very great confidence. The subject has been treated with great delicacy by Père Perraud, now Bishop of Autun, in a pamphlet published shortly after Father Gratry's death, under the title *Le Père Gratry, ses derniers jours, son testament spirituel*, par le Père Adolphe Perraud, Prêtre de l'Oratoire, et Professeur à la Sorbonne (Paris : Ch. Douniol,

1872): "It was urged upon him as an obligation of conscience to take an active part in the contest for which his previous occupations had, perhaps, not sufficiently prepared him. He shrank from appearing to yield to an egotistical desire of repose if he refused to engage in the combat; and this man, who had up to the last year of his life been distinguished by the naive simplicity of a child, threw himself into the battle without sufficient regard either to the danger to which he exposed himself or to his own ability to meet it."²

Then follows another extract from the same pamphlet:

Some time after [his letter to Archbishop Guibert] writing to one of his brethren in the Academy (M. Legouvé, if I remember right) on the subject of some painful expressions that had been uttered in reference to himself, he stated with admirable clearness the motives of his adhesion to the decrees of the Council. A copy of this letter is amongst his papers, and I think it right to give it publicity because of its exceptional importance:

"My very dear and honoured Brother,—When the era of polemics was opened in the Church, I entered into the combat in accordance with my conscience and my rights; you approved, and I was content. Now that the decision has come, you will approve of my submission to it; of that I am certain. What would St. Francis of Sales, St. Vincent of Paul, Fénelon, and Bossuet have done under the circumstances? You know; we all know: not one of them would have entertained for an instant the thought of separation from the Church. That I have no such thought, you are well aware; and if I had it, you would bar its execution, you and every one of my colleagues without exception; and herein I am well content."

Father Gratry's noble and touching letter to the Archbishop of Paris, in which he declares his acceptance of the Vatican decree, is the best comment we can offer on the foregoing statements:

If I had not been very sick and unable to write a letter, I should have some days ago paid my homage of welcome.

I wish at least to-day, my lord, to say simply that which it seems to me needed not to be said at all, that I accept, in common with all my brethren in the priesthood, the decrees of the Vatican Council. All that I have written contrary to those decrees before the decision I efface.

We shall not waste words on a style of controversy that presses a witness like Father Gratry into its service without a word of explanation of the actual and crowning facts of the case.

² Pp. 44, 45.

Perhaps Mr. Willis will shield himself from the serious charges to which he has laid himself open as a controversialist by pleading Father Gratry's case as a proof of the truth of "the monstrous and suicidal boast" that "dogma has conquered history," which he attributes to the most conspicuous ecclesiastic of the Roman communion in this country. But Mr. Willis ought to have known that no such boast was ever uttered, and therefore cannot be used as the foundation for the principle that "dogma can triumph over history." Of course the accusation is levelled against the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and it is thus met by Father Humphrey in his Preface to *The Divine Teacher*. Father Humphrey says "that he (the Cardinal) ever said these words, or gave utterance to any idea which might be legitimately expressed by those words, I know to be untrue, for I have ascertained it." What his Eminence has said on the subject may be profitably studied by Mr. Willis and those who may have been misled by his statements, in the same Preface. We would seriously commend the whole pamphlet to their perusal.

We ought perhaps to apologize for so long an excursus before coming to the subject-matter of Mr. Willis's pamphlet; but as Mr. Willis has made his Preface the receptacle of the thread-bare common-places of Protestant controversy that have been noticed, and others, too, that have not been noticed, we did not see how we could well pass them over without some such general notice as should indicate at least the general lines on which objections of the kind are met by Catholics. Let us now turn to Pope Honorius. And first of all let a few words be said as to the subject-matter of the controversy in which Honorius, unhappily for himself, and in a special way, unhappily for all those who attack and even for those who have to defend his memory, got mixed up.

The special heresy in question was the Monothelite heresy. This heresy may be regarded as the last offshoot of the great Arian controversy that so long troubled the Church. The fundamental error of Arius was that Jesus Christ, though existing before His Incarnation in the glory and splendour of the Eternal Father's presence, was still only a Creature. A time had been, however remote, in which He existed not. This heresy was condemned by the Nicene Council. But though heresies be smitten with anathemas, they do not shrivel up and die away at once. The root may be mortally injured,

but the hot-bed of the human mind will continue to supply its stimulating powers so as to continue that root in a lingering existence, of which proof will be afforded by the shooting forth of branches and pestilent suckers form a very mass of rottenness and decay. Thus, when Arianism proper had been smitten by the Church's voice, it reasserted itself in the form of Nestorianism; and when Nestorianism in turn was smitten, it once more reappeared in the shape of Eutychianism; and when Eutychianism again was smitten, the heresy took the final form of Monothelism. For the Arian principle really lies at the bottom of all these various forms of heretical manifestation. When Arianism was condemned, our Lord's Divine Nature was affirmed; upon this Nestorianism arose, admitting the Divine and Human Natures in Christ, but asserting the duality of Persons; when the unity of Person was safe-guarded by the decrees of Ephesus, Eutychianism proclaimed the unity of Nature as following upon the unity of Person, a unity brought about by the absorption of the Human Nature of Christ into the Divine. This in time was rejected by the Church under the guidance of Pope Leo; but the Arian principle was not yet dead, and it played its last card in the assertion of Monothelism; that is, that admitting the unity of Person, and the duality of Natures in Christ, yet the Human Nature of our Lord was so overshadowed, or rather overpowered, by the Divine, that as regards the great principle of moral action in a rational agent, the will (that is, the operation of the human will in Christ) was extinguished, or practically at least supplanted by the Divine will, so that there was but one will in our Lord, one operation. It is hardly necessary to point out that such a doctrine in a certain sense annihilated our Lord's Human Nature; for it deprived it of all moral action, inasmuch as it reduced His Human Nature to the condition of a mere mechanical instrument, wielded and directed in its operations by the will of the other nature that was Divine. Briefly, the Monothelites (1) acknowledged in Christ one sole Divine operation pervading the Sacred Humanity, which was merely its instrument; (2) as a consequence, they did not acknowledge in Christ more than one will and that Divine; (3) and therefore implicitly, and as a further consequence, they admitted the capital error of the Monophysites, for while admitting the real existence of Christ's Manhood in words, they upheld a substantial change in its qualities from the inflow of the Divine Word, a change that

deprived that Manhood of its essential character of moral agent. Thus a blow was struck at the character of our Lord's Mediation itself, and all the consequences depending on it; for the essential character of that Mediation, and therefore the value of all that is involved in it, rests on the union of the true and perfect Natures of God and Man in the One Person of Jesus Christ. But the Human Nature of Jesus Christ would be no longer perfect if divested of the power of will.³

The charge against Honorius is that he committed himself to this Monothelite heresy; or that if he did not so commit himself, at least he gave colourable pretext for such a charge; that in consequence he was anathematized as a heretic by the Sixth General Council. Moreover, it is urged by Mr. Willis, that in any case, whether Honorius were really heretical or not, the fact of the condemnation of a Pope for *heresy* shows that the Council supposed that a Pope could fall into heresy and be judged for such by a General Council, and that as a matter of necessary consequence the Bishops of the Council could not have held the Infallibility of the Pope. "It is the absolutely unassailable fact of Honorius' *condemnation* as a heretic which they must get rid of in order to establish their new dogma of Papal Infallibility."⁴ This is the burden that, according to Mr. Willis, is thrown upon Catholics by the Vatican decree by which the Successor of St. Peter is declared infallible when he teaches *ex cathedra* the Universal Church in matters of faith or morals. The decisions of the two Councils are contradictory; you cannot therefore hold to both. You must either hold to the Vatican and reject the Constantinopolitan, or you must keep to the Constantinopolitan and give up the Vatican. There is no middle way.

Before proceeding to deal with this difficulty, for difficulty it is, let us say a word or two on the course of events that led up to those utterances of Pope Honorius which gave rise to the controversy that has in these latter times been surging so persistently round his name.

Sergius became Patriarch of Constantinople in A.D. 610. He met with a letter ascribed to his predecessor Mennas, probably not genuine (A.D. 552), in which our Lord is said to "have one will and one life-giving operation." Sergius consulted Theodore, Bishop of Pharan, on the subject, and, following his opinion, adopted the phrase. It became the formula of the Monothelites.

³ Cf. Bottalla, *Pope Honorius*, p. 16.

⁴ P. 22.

Discussion arose, in the course of which the Emperor Heraclius consulted Cyrus, Bishop of Phasis, who in turn wrote to Sergius for advice on the subject. Sergius replied that the Church had decided nothing; that Cyril of Alexandria and other approved Fathers had spoken of "one life-giving operation"; that Mennas, his predecessor, had used like expressions, and that Cyrus was mistaken in supposing that Leo the Great had taught "two operations." Cyrus seems to have been satisfied by Sergius' reply; at any rate, being raised to the patriarchal throne of Alexandria in A.D. 633, he effected a union with the Theodosians, a Monophysite sect, on terms that, amongst other things, contained the doctrine that our Lord "wrought the acts appertaining both to God and man by one theandric operation." The Monophysites regarded the terms of union as a triumph for themselves; they had not gone over to the Church, they boasted, but the Church had come to them.

Sophronius, a monk of Palestine, was at that time in Alexandria, and was dissatisfied with the articles of union. Failing to make any impression on the views of Cyrus, Sophronius proceeded to Constantinople. The result of his conferences with Sergius was that Sergius agreed not to insist on the expression "one operation," while on the other hand Sophronius promised not to use the phrase "two operations."

Sophronius was soon after raised to the Chair of Jerusalem (A.D. 633 or 634). Sergius took alarm at this, and wrote to Pope Honorius, detailing the events that have been described, and asking him to declare his opinion on the question at issue. Honorius replied in a letter that, together with two fragments of a second letter, entered in the Acts of the Thirteenth Session of the Sixth General Council, form the subject-matter of the Honorian controversy.

Let us now return to our difficulty. The difficulty is freely admitted. How do Catholics meet it? They simply deny that Honorius committed any error in any definition of faith, or that he was condemned for any such definition. This being so, the alleged contradiction between the Sixth General Council and the Vatican Council falls to the ground.

When a man lies under any charge, it is sufficient to show that the evidence against him does not bear it out. If it can be shown that the evidence contains several serious flaws, the verdict must be given in favour of the accused. The case stands simply thus with Pope Honorius. He is accused of having

erred in a definition of faith ; and moreover it is alleged that he was condemned for having so erred. Evidence is produced in support of the charge and of the allegation. The evidence is found to falter on various points ; this variation leads to various lines of defence. Nor is the multiplication of the modes of defence a sign of weakness ; on the contrary, just in proportion as each possesses inherent probability, does the mass of probabilities accumulate against the evidence produced in the case. One method of defence that carries a solid probability with it is enough to destroy the certainty of the adverse evidence ; if several methods can be shown to have each its solid probability, the opposing certainty will be proportionately reduced, and indeed sink into mere probability, if it can even lay claim to that in the face of the accumulated probabilities against it.

Bearing this principle in mind, let us return to the various defences that are set up in favour of Honorius.⁵

1. The first method of defence abstracts altogether from the question of the genuineness of the various documents connected with the question. Let that be taken for granted, for even if they are genuine, they have nothing material to the difficulty against Honorius. The whole question centres in the point, whether Honorius in his two letters to Sergius taught Monothelism ; and not only taught it, but dogmatically stated that there was only one will in Christ, and by so doing can be proved to have promulgated *ex cathedrâ* an heretical definition of faith as the official head of the Church. The contention of Catholic theologians, who take up the line of defence with which we are at present concerned, simply denies that any definition can be found in the letters of Honorius enunciating Monothelite doctrine, or indeed any doctrine whatever, save the Catholic doctrine of the two perfect natures subsisting in the one Person of Jesus Christ.

For in the first place, if we examine the reasonings and motives contained in the body of Honorius' letter that lead up to what may be called his final authoritative declaration, we find that Honorius teaches, in clear and precise terms, the Catholic and orthodox doctrine concerning the two-fold will and the two-fold operation of our Lord Jesus Christ. In his second letter to Sergius, he says : *Sed utrasque naturas in uno Christo unitate naturali copulatas, cum alterius communione*

⁵ On this matter, cf. Bouix, *de Papa*, who discusses the question at length. Tom. ii. p. 290.

operantes atque operatrices, confiteri debemus : et divinam quidem quæ Dei sunt operantem, et humanam quæ carnis sunt exequentem—“ But we ought to confess both natures, joined together in one Christ by a natural union, *working* with one another, and *workers* together in mutual fellowship ; the Divine Nature working the things which are of God, and the human those which are of the flesh.” And a little further on he adds : *Oportet nos . . . duas naturas, id est divinitatis et carnis assumptæ . . . inconfusè, indivisè atque inconvertibiliter nobiscum prædicare propria operantes—*“ We must preach two natures, *i.e.*, of the Godhead and of the flesh assumed (*i.e.*, united to the Divine Nature), without confusion of natures, undividedly, and without change, each working that which is proper to it.” There is one more passage of a like kind in Honorius’ first letter : *Confitentes Dominum Jesum Christum . . . operatum divina . . . eundemque operatum humana . . . discrete, inconfuse, atque inconvertibiliter—*“ Confessing that the Lord Jesus Christ worked Divine things . . . and that the same also worked human things . . . without mixture or confusion or change of nature.”

Now clearly in these passages Honorius teaches a two-fold operation corresponding to the *two-fold* nature. The Divine Nature works that which is Divine and proper to the Divinity ; the Human Nature in like manner works that which is human and proper to the Humanity, these expressions being carefully safeguarded by the statement that each Nature performs the operations proper to it, *discretè, inconfusè, et inconvertibiliter*, distinct from one another, without confusion or intermixture with one another in respect of the functions connatural to each, and without any change in that which is essential to either Nature. But such a statement as this cuts at the root of the Monothelistic doctrine, for that consisted in substituting the Divine will for the human will, or in other words, in the suppression of one of the faculties essential to human nature, the human will itself. For it is not too much to say that Honorius jealously preserves in the passages we have been considering the full integrity of the Human Nature of our Lord both in its powers and operations. His words, taken according to their literal meaning, can mean nothing else. Therefore Honorius did not teach Monothelism.

And so thought the Sixth General Council, it would seem. St. Leo had said in his dogmatic letter to Flavian, *Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium est ;*

verbo scilicet operante quod verbi est, et carne exequente quod carnis est—"Each form (or nature) works that which is proper to it, in mutual communion: The Word working that which is proper to the Word, and the flesh working that which is proper to the flesh." And these words were recited in the Sixth General Council, and the Legates of the Roman See exclaimed, "Behold, the Holy Father *manifestly* proclaims two natural operations without confusion and without division in Jesus Christ our Lord"—*Ecce manifestè duas naturales operationes inconfuse et indivise in Domino nostro Jesu Christo præsens sanctissimus prædicat pater.*" And the Synod assented to these words of the Legates, with the sole exception of the obstinate Monothelite Macarius.

Now the words of St. Leo are well-nigh identical with the words of Honorius that have been already quoted; nay, indeed, the terms used by Honorius are even stronger and clearer than those used by St. Leo. If, then, the Council accepted the words of St. Leo as condemnatory of the Monothelite doctrine, with what consistency could it attribute that doctrine to Honorius in the face of his careful and definite statements? If Honorius was a heretic, as having taught Monothelite doctrine, what then was St. Leo?

Again, the impugners of Honorius' orthodoxy bring forward certain phrases and expressions as containing a formal statement of the Monothelite heresy. One of them is the famous sentence, *Unde et unam voluntatem fatemur Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*—"We confess one will in our Lord Jesus Christ." And out of this Mr. Willis makes no small capital. And certainly at first sight the statement is a formidable one. "We confess *one will* in our Lord Jesus Christ." What more would you have? we suppose Mr. Willis would say, "Monothelism is Monothelism. It asserts that there is *one will only* in our Lord; and Pope Honorius says precisely the same. Therefore Honorius is a Monothelite and a heretic." What is to be said in reply to this?

Well, let us proceed gently. And let us first of all recall to mind the words of the German poet—

*Words answer famously as swords,—
Men can make systems out of words.*

Thus it has happened, we fear, with Mr. Willis and his friends. In fact, Mr. Willis has come to grief over the one trisyllabic

word, *voluntas*. But how? Surely *voluntas* means will, and nothing else. Precisely so; but what does *will* mean? It may mean two things; and if so, the question comes, which of the two does it mean in the passage before us? Will may mean the power or faculty of willing; that faculty of the soul by the exercise of which we determine ourselves to this or that action, by which, in a word, we will to do a thing or to leave it undone; and when we so resolve, that resolution is called an act of the will, or simply our will to act in one way rather than another. Will then clearly has two meanings; it stands for the faculty of willing; or again it may stand for any given moral act of that faculty. Facciolati will bear us out in attributing this two-fold meaning to the word *voluntas*. This being so, the question at once arises, in what sense did Honorius use the word *voluntas*, "will," when he said, "We confess *one will* in Jesus Christ our Lord?" Did he speak of the will as a faculty, or did he speak of the acts of the will? Of the will in *actu primo*, or of the will in *actu secundo*, as the scholastics put it? In other words, did Honorius mean the faculty of willing? If he did, then he clearly enunciated heresy; for his statement would simply amount to the assertion that there was only one faculty of willing in the God-Man, Jesus Christ, the Divine faculty of willing, which also was the only faculty of willing through and by which the Human Nature of Christ could act, if, indeed, we would still in such a case continue to speak of Christ as the God-Man, when an essential faculty and function in His Human Nature had been supplanted and suppressed by the substitution of a faculty not connatural to it. And then in this case too Honorius would contradict himself, for he could no longer speak of the union of the Divine and Human Natures in the Person of Christ as effected *discrete, inconfuse, indivise, inconvertibiliter*.

But Honorius may not have contradicted himself, simply because there was no question in his mind as to the one or two faculties of willing in Christ, the Human and Divine; or if there were question, he had settled that implicitly in the terms in which he had spoken of the union of the two Natures in their full integrity, without confusion, without division, without change. If then he did not speak of the *one will* of Christ in the sense of a oneness of faculty, he must have spoken of a *oneness of act*; and then would occur the further question, if Honorius spoke of the oneness of will in Christ with reference

to the acts of that will, inasmuch as there exist two faculties of willing in Him, the Divine and Human, of the acts of which faculty did he speak when he stated that there is only *one will* in our Lord Jesus Christ? And the answer is, that Pope Honorius spoke of the *Human will* of Jesus Christ; and in asserting the one will, he meant to teach, and did teach, that in our Lord, in so far as His Human will was concerned, there were none of those contrary manifestations that are apparent in the will of man subjected to the conditions of his fallen nature, and which we daily experience in ourselves, and which the Apostle speaks of as the will of the flesh and the will of the mind, which two are contrary the one to the other. Such opposing acts of the human will, though found in nature that is vitiated and fallen, are not found in the Human Nature of Christ, inasmuch as the Nature which he took to Himself was that which was created before sin invaded it—the Nature, not the fault, the Nature untainted by transgression. Therefore there was one Human will in Christ, inasmuch as there was perfect conformity of all the acts of that will with the will of His Divine Father, with the Divine will existing in Himself.

Mr. Willis speaks of this explanation as “inadmissible, as a glance at the context will show.” Well, glances are dangerous things very often, and especially so where grave and careful consideration is required. It is to be feared that Mr. Willis contented himself with a glance; for to any one examining the passage in question, it is clearer than light that it is precisely of the Human will of Christ that Honorius is speaking. “We confess one will in our Lord Jesus Christ,” says Honorius, “precisely because our nature, not the fault of our nature, was assumed by the Divinity, that nature, to wit, that was created before sin, not that which was vitiated by prevarication. The nature that the Word of God took upon Him was nature such as it existed in the state of innocence before it was depraved by the fall. Hence in the members of Jesus Christ there was not another law or a diverse will, contrary to or opposing itself to the Redeemer, because He was born in a supernatural manner, above the ordinary conditions of human nature.” And in illustration the Pope refers to the conflict between the law of the members and the law of the mind which St. Paul dwells upon⁶ as existing in fallen human nature, a conflict not found in Christ the Redeemer, because it was not fallen human nature that he

⁶ Romans viii. 23.

had assumed. And in further illustration Honorius adduces the passages, "I came not to do My own will, but the will of the Father Who sent Me;"⁷ "Father, not as I will, but as Thou wilt."⁸ These expressions, he says, must be taken in an accommodatitious sense, and as setting us an example; not in the sense that there was any contrariety of will in Christ, but that by such expressions He might teach us to bring our wills or willings into full harmony with the will or willings of His Eternal Father.

Now here I ask our readers to pause and ask themselves of what will is Honorius here all along speaking? Is there a word about the Divine will in any direct way? Is not the whole utterance concerning the Human Nature of Christ and the will of that nature?

Again, is there a single word of the Divine will as a faculty in Christ? Nay, is there a word of the human will as a faculty in Christ? On the contrary, is not the whole speech of the acts of the will that Christ had assumed as an essential part of His pure humanity, all of which were always in perfect harmony with the eternal act of the will of the Eternal Father?

More might be said, but what has been said is enough to show the rashness, audacity, and extreme futility of Mr. Willis's appeal to Honorius' context. So far from helping him, it goes in direct contradiction to his allegations.

Besides, we have confirmation of our view of Honorius' meaning, which is thus given by Father Bottalla in his pamphlet on Honorius.⁹

We can refer to the evidence of St. Maximus, who, after the death of Sophronius, was the great doctor of the Eastern Church, the leader of the Catholics against the Monothelite faction; the man who, after having convinced Pyrrhus, the Monothelite Patriarch of Constantinople, that he had been upholding error, persuaded him to place a written retraction in the hands of Pope Theodore; the man who suffered persecution and finally martyrdom for the faith. In like manner we can refer to the testimony of Pope John the Fourth, who succeeded Honorius in the Pontifical See after the two months' reign of Severinus, and who wrote and addressed to the Emperor Constantine an apology in favour of Honorius, against the calumnious letter of the Patriarch Pyrrhus. Finally, we can bring forward the evidence of Abbot John, secretary both to Honorius and to John the Fourth, who drew up the letter addressed by Honorius to Sergius, and who could not fail to understand its purport correctly, while his character affords us a gua-

⁷ St. John vi. 38.

⁸ St. Matt. xxvi. 39.

⁹ P. 59.

rantee of his veracity; for, as we learn from St. Maximus, he was a man who had illustrated all the West with his virtues and religious doctrine. Now St. Maximus, Pope John the Fourth, and Abbot John, all testify most clearly that Pope Honorius, when asserting one will in Christ our Lord, had in view the Sacred Humanity only, in which he denied the existence of two contrary wills (p. 8).

Mr. Willis has a passage concerning Pope John the Fourth and his testimony to Honorius' orthodoxy which we feel bound to produce, and especially to notice as one sample, and there are many such, of his accuracy and capacity for fair controversy. It is as follows—

Pope John the Fourth, writing in A.D. 641, clearly demonstrates the impossibility of explaining into orthodoxy the assertion, "We acknowledge one will of our Lord Jesus Christ." "What will," he asks, "is meant, human or Divine? Divine? But to say that is to deny the true Humanity of Christ, and to fall into Manichean error. Human? To say that would involve condemnation as denying the Divinity of Christ, like Photinus and Ebion. One will arising from the union of two natures? But what is that but confounding the natures?"

We have, then, papal authority for asserting that whatever Honorius may have *meant* by saying "We acknowledge one will of our Lord Jesus Christ," the assertion, in its plain literal sense, was distinctly heretical.

Such is Mr. Willis's statement. Now we have not time to examine and analyze the whole of Pope John the Fourth's letter in order to show his utter inaccuracy; neither is it necessary. The context of the passage that Mr. Willis cites is sufficient for our purpose.

How do our readers think the passage is ushered in by John the Fourth?

Prædictus ergo decessor meus docens de Mystério Incarnationis Christi dicebat, non fuisse in eo, sicut in nobis peccatoribus, mentis et carnis contrarias voluntates: quod quidam ad proprium sensum convertentes, divinitatis et humanitatis unam eum voluntatem docuisse suspicati sunt—"Therefore, my predecessor aforesaid, teaching concerning the mystery of the Incarnation of Christ, said that there were not in Him, as in us sinners, the contrary wills of the mind and of the flesh; which some twisting to their own sense and views, supposed him to have taught one will of His Divinity and Humanity. But," the Pope proceeds, "I would wish these persons to reply to my questions, What will is meant, Human or Divine?" (and so on through the rest of the passage quoted by Mr. Willis.)

See then how on John the Fourth's testimony the matter stands. He states explicitly that the words of Honorius, "We

confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ," mean in his mouth the Human will of Jesus Christ, denying that in it there existed the contrary wills of the mind and the flesh. Then he states that some had misrepresented the words of Honorius as teaching the one faculty of will in our Lord, a doctrine, says the Pope, which is in every way contrary to truth. And then he turns to those persons, and not to Honorius, and addresses the questions which we have heard to *them*, with the view of convicting them of their error, not Honorius of his. And yet Mr. Willis triumphantly explains that we have Papal authority for saying that the words of Honorius were distinctly heretical.

It is to be feared that this is the result of another of Mr. Willis's glances. But seriously, what is to be thought of carelessness and slovenliness like this in so grave a matter?

Having, as I trust, now found our way to the heel of Mr. Willis's Achilles, let us turn to the only matter that can be called a definition in Honorius' Letter, if it can be said to deserve the name. It amounts to this, in Mr. Willis's words: he forbids the use alike of the orthodox expression, "two operations," and of the heretical phrase, "one operation." How far such a prohibition can be called a dogmatic definition will be considered further on. It is sufficient at present to consider what Honorius precisely means by the word operation.

Now the word "operation" (*ἐνέργεια*) is like the word *voluntas* (will) capable of two meanings: it may mean the faculty or power of operation, or, in a word, faculty in action; or it may mean the actual outcome of the exercise of that power, the *act* of any given *faculty*. If we take operation to mean faculty in action, then in Christ there are two operations, for there are two faculties of willing in Him, the human and the Divine; but if we take operation to mean the outcome of the exercise of the faculty of willing, then it would be futile to say that in Christ there was one operation or that there were two operations, since Christ performed not one act or two only, but innumerable and multiform acts. Therefore, says Honorius, it is plainly quite foolish to talk of one or two operations in the Mediator between God and man, Jesus Christ. "*Unius autem operationis vel duarum esse vel fuisse Mediatorem Dei et hominum Jesum Christum, sentire et promere, satis ineptum est.*"¹⁰

In short, we see that Honorius treats the question of the operations as he treats the question of the wills in Christ. In

¹⁰ Epist. ii. *Hon. ad Sergium*.

both cases he speaks of acts and not of faculties. This view is entirely borne out by the context. Let the two following passages stand as examples.

Nos enim non unam operationem vel duas Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum ejusque Sanctum Spiritum, Sacris litteris percepimus, sed multiformiter cognovimus operatum.—"For we have seen from the Sacred Scriptures, that our Lord Jesus Christ and His Holy Spirit have performed not one operation or two only, but we know that He worked in ways manifold" (Epist. i.).

And again :

Si enim in aliis, id est, in membris suis, Spiritus Christi multiformiter operatur, quanto magis per semetipsum mediatorem Dei et hominum, plenè ac perfectè, multisque modis, et ineffabilibus confideri nos communione utriusque naturæ condecet operatum.—"For if in others, that is in His members, the Spirit of Christ works in manners multiform, how much more ought we to confess that the Mediator between God and man works in Himself fully perfectly, and in ways manifold and ineffable?" (*Ibid.*)

The conclusion to be drawn from all this is plain to full evidence, namely, that when Honorius prohibited the use of the expressions *one operation* and *two operations*, he grounded his prohibition on the meaning of the word *operation* that indicates acts, and not faculties. Into the question of operations regarded as faculties he does not enter, and therefore decides nothing in the matter of the existence of the two distinct faculties or powers of will in Christ. Honorius, therefore, by his prohibition certainly does not commit himself to Monothelism.

Enough has now been said to show the nature of the first line of defence in the case of Honorius. It amounts simply to this, that, as far as words go, Honorius was certainly not heretical, committed himself to no heretical statement, and therefore it is fair to infer the absence of any interior heretical pravity. He may have written as he did certainly from a spirit of conciliation and compromise, probably from vagueness of view and incapacity to grasp all the issues of the grave question proposed to him, but clearly from no formed opinions of a kind that put him in contradiction to the faith of the Church. Nay more, it is perhaps not too much to say that Honorius, while acting in a spirit of conciliation, and economically as the phrase goes, may have been quite alive to the true nature and sense at least of the main issues of the rising controversy. This

may be inferred from his reticence that can hardly be regarded as other than conscious and intended with respect to the question of the two faculties or wills in Christ ; and the persistent manner in which he tries to confine the discussion to the region of acts. But let what has been said suffice for the present, although this first method of defence has been by no means exhausted.

2. Let us now give a brief consideration to the second method. It is this : in his two letters to Sergius, Honorius did not teach *ex cathedrâ*, but only as a private person. This is the view of Thomassin. In substance we agree with it, though we cannot see how Honorius can be considered quite in the light of a private person in this matter. Mr. Willis says it is a case in which the first Patriarch of the East formally consults the Patriarch of the West. Well, if this be all, no more need be said, for no one supposes that the Pope as Patriarch of the West is infallible. We go further, and are quite willing to concede that Sergius consults Honorius as the Successor of St. Peter and Head of the Universal Church. But it does not follow from this that Honorius' reply to Sergius was an *ex cathedrâ* utterance all the same ; for in point of fact it was not so, as we shall presently see. Mr. Willis tries to make capital out of the fact that the phrase *ex cathedrâ* has only been called into existence, as he says, by the exigences of modern Roman developments, and that therefore to bring it into connection with Honorius at all is a palpable anachronism. If this be so, the question is at an end, for, as we conceive, the whole controversy circles round the question whether Honorius' letter can be brought within the category of utterances that would be called *ex cathedrâ*, according to the Vatican definition. The term *ex cathedrâ* has a definite place in theological science. It means that when a decision concerning faith or morals is published by the Roman Pontiff as of binding obligation upon the whole Church, such a decision is an infallible decision from which there is no appeal. The whole question therefore is whether the utterance of Honorius, whatever it may be, is a decision that bears with it the above-named marks, and whether being such, it was condemned by the Sixth General Council. If a decision that bears with it the marks of an *ex cathedrâ* decision were ever thus treated by so grave an authority as a General Council, it is clear that the Vatican decree receives a deadly wound. To talk about the term *ex cathedrâ* therefore, as Mr. Willis does, is merely to raise mists that obscure our mental view of the point at issue.

We assert, then, that neither the letter of Honorius, nor any part of the letter of Honorius, bears with it the characteristics of an *ex cathedrâ* pronouncement.

Mr. Willis makes one rather feeble attempt to bring it within the range of the Vatican definition, which, however, only betrays him into his usual inaccuracy. He says that the Fathers of the Sixth General Council say: "Together with the dogmatic letters of Sergius we have examined that (dogmatic letter) of Honorius, and found them alien from Apostolic teaching."¹¹ But when we turn to the original we find that it stands as follows: *Retractantes dogmaticas epistolas, quæ tanquam a Sergio quondam patriarcha hujus a Deo conservandæ regîe urbis scriptæ sunt. . . Similiter autem et epistolam ab illo, id est, Honorio, rescriptam ad eundem Sergium.*

We find, therefore, that the term "dogmatic" is not applied by the Fathers to Honorius' letter; they speak of his *letter* only. There may not be much in this, but it is perhaps worth noticing because of its being one instance of the way in which Honorius and the letters of Honorius are, for the most part, spoken of in the Conciliar and Papal documents connected with the question. Almost universally there is some conditioning clause or omission, as in this case, that puts him out of the category of the others who were condemned by the Sixth Council.

But to return to the assertion that Honorius' letter is not in any sense an *ex cathedrâ* document.

(1) "One test," to use Dr. Ward's words, "on which theologians lay great stress, is that of *publication*. By the fact of circulating a *dogmatic letter throughout the Church* a Pontiff expresses that it is intended not for those only or for him only to whom it is addressed, but for all Catholics. In Honorius' day it was the universal habit of Popes so to act when they issued dogmatic letters *ex cathedrâ*; Orsi insists on this, quoting an earlier writer in his support. Such letters were "transmitted to the Primates or Patriarchs of provinces, unless, indeed, there were some special reason for sending them to others. Then the Primates, or those others, communicated copies of them to the Bishops, either separately or synodically; and often both subscribed the letters themselves, and required their suffragans so to do."¹² Now it is most certain that Honorius never thus

¹¹ P. 12.

¹² Lib. i. c. xxii. § 5.

circulated his letter to Sergius, and stress is laid on the fact by Roncaglia and Muzzarelli.¹³

Orsi, after the above statements, proceeds to dwell on the fact that nothing of the kind took place with either of Honorius' letters to Sergius. Sergius and his successors, he says, instead of proposing Honorius' letter for subscription proposed Heraclius's *Ecthesis* or Constans's *Type*.

(2) There is a second argument given by Dr. Ward as an abridgment of Muzzarelli, which we in turn venture to abridge. It was the constant habit of the Roman Pontiff never to speak *ex cathedrâ* without first assembling a synod either of Bishops or of Roman Presbyters; more commonly the former. Thus acted Innocent and Zosimus against Pelagianism, Celestine against Nestorius, Leo against Eutyches, John the Fourth in this very Monothelite controversy, as well as Theodore Martin and Agatho. But Honorius' letter to Sergius was not preceded by any such consultation, and this departure from the custom of the time sufficiently shows that he never intended it *ex cathedrâ*.

Then, again, in the professions of faith contained in the *Liber Diurnus*, the Popes promise to accept and teach whatever their predecessors have *synodically* accepted and preached, and to anathematize whatever their predecessors have *synodically* anathematized. They use the word *synodically* as synonymous with *ex cathedrâ*, as it would now be called. We will sum up the above two arguments in the words of Father Bottalla.

According to the discipline and practice of the Church in ancient times, which was preserved for many centuries, there are some solemnities which were ordinarily observed when dogmatic constitutions were despatched by the Roman Pontiffs. They were previously read and examined in the Synod of the Bishops of Italy, with whom the prelates of neighbouring provinces were sometimes associated; or in the assembly of the Clergy of the Roman Church. Again, they were sent to the Primate and Metropolitans, that they might be everywhere known and obeyed. Finally, the signatures of all the Bishops were often required to these Papal constitutions to show their submission and adhesion to them. We do not now mean to spend time in demonstrating these points of ancient discipline; they will be found proved beyond all question in the learned works of Coustant, Thomasinus, Cardinal Orsi, and others. It must be distinctly understood that we do not maintain the absolute necessity of the above-mentioned characters, as if no Papal utterance of that age could be *ex cathedrâ* if any one of these marks were wanting. But we maintain affirmatively

¹³ Ward, *Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 19.

that Papal utterances bearing all these characters were to be regarded as certainly issued *ex cathedrâ*, and negatively that no Papal decree could be considered at that time *ex cathedrâ* if wanting in all and each of these characters (pp. 18, 19).

(3) There can be no question, then, that from the extrinsic history of Honorius' letters they were not issued *ex cathedrâ*. And this conclusion is fully borne out by the intrinsic structure of the letters themselves.

It is laid down by theologians "that even in dogmatic constitutions and bulls, not all which therein occurs or is mentioned incidentally, not a preface, nor what is laid down as the basis of a decree, is to be looked upon as itself a dogmatic definition, and so as matter of Infallibility."¹⁴ If, then, Honorius erred in an *ex cathedrâ* definition, there must have been some definition in which he so erred. What, then, is the definition that Honorius laid down and published in some sufficient way, and so imposed upon all Christians the obligation to accept it? The only thing that can in any sense be called a definition is the prohibition to use either of the phrases, "one operation" and "two operations." But this, as Thomassinus says, is no definition; it does not in any way pretend to define anything as of faith; it is rather the suspension of a decree than a decree itself. As Dr. Ward says, "So far from *commanding* them to hold any such *doctrine*, he did not even *ask* them to form any such *opinion*. All he desired was external conformity; and he obtained his full purpose as soon as that outward conformity was secured. The whole proceeding was disciplinary, not doctrinal, from beginning to end."¹⁵ Indeed, in his second letter Honorius declares expressly that he has no intention of uttering a definition in the remarkable passage in which he declares at once his own line of action in the difficulty in which he was placed, and gives forth a clear profession of orthodox belief.

Auferentes ergo, sicut diximus, scandalum novelle adinventionis, non nos oportet unam vel duas operationes definientes prædicare, sed pro una, quam quidam dicunt, operatione, oportet nos unum operatorem Christum Dominum in utrisque naturis veridice confiteri; et pro duabus operationibus, ablato gemine operationis vocabulo, ipsas potius duas naturas, id est, divinitatis et carnis assumptæ, in una persona unigeniti Dei Patris, inconfuse, indivise atque inconvertibiliter nobiscum prædicare propria operantes—"Taking away, then, the scandal of a newly-invented phrase, we ought not by attempting an accurate definition to preach one or

¹⁴ Melchior Canus, *De Loc. Theol.* lib. v. cap. v.

¹⁵ P. 23.

two operations, but instead of one operation, as some do, we ought to confess one Operator, Christ our Lord, really and truly in both natures; and for two operations, the word double operation being suppressed, we ought to preach those two natures, that is, the Divinity and the flesh assumed by it, each operating in the one Person of the Only-Begotten of God the Father, without confusion, without division, and without change those things that are proper to it."

We will sum up in Dr. Ward's words.

An *ex cathedrâ* act is an act in which some Pope purports to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine. And this definition being supposed, it is most certain that Honorius did not teach any false doctrine *ex cathedrâ*. This is most certain, because no one can so much as *name* any one false doctrine in regard to which he will even *allege* that Honorius imposed on the whole Church an obligation of believing it (p. 24).

We may finally add another consideration, which is involved, indeed, in what has been already stated. It is this: that one of the marks of an *ex cathedrâ* pronouncement is its recognition as such by the Church at large, its reflection, so to speak, as an infallible utterance in the passive infallibility of the faithful. Not, of course, that such recognition is to be regarded as an acceptance requisite to give force to the dogma, but as an evidence of its being already lodged, implicitly at least, in the belief of the Universal Church. The unanimous reception and recognition of the definition of the Immaculate Conception and of the Infallibility of the Pope are examples of what we mean. These definitions only gave voice and utterance to the pre-existing belief of the body of the faithful. But we have nothing analogous to this in the case of Honorius' letters. They are as much wanting in any proof of recognition by the Church as they are wanting in the marks that characterize any formal exercise of her active infallibility, whether manifested by the voice of a General Council or of her official head, the successor of St. Peter and the Vicar of Christ. Honorius' letters were never recognized as official, *ex cathedrâ*, documents, because they were never issued under that character.

3. A third defence of Honorius is that, admitting the genuineness of the acts of the Sixth General Council, the other documents that are brought in evidence against Honorius are either spurious or have been interpolated. The prevailing opinion, I think, amongst Catholic theologians is that this charge cannot be substantiated, and that, even if it could, it is not worth

while to do so, as the character of Honorius can be sufficiently vindicated without questioning the genuineness of any document or any portion of the documents that are urged against him. Still the opinion in question has found defenders, and amongst them are the theologians of Würzburg, who have produced one of the ablest of the many courses of theology in the Church. Time will not permit us to enter into their proofs of this view, though they are many, and of no light character; but we must abstain from any discussion of them here.

4. The last mode of defence was that of denying the genuineness of the acts of the Sixth General Council, and it is sanctioned by the names of Baronius and Bellarmine. This method does not differ from the former except that it adds to it the assertion that the acts of the Synod have been tampered with, and that the name of Honorius has been substituted for that of Theodore, who was the person really condemned by the Council. It is fair to say that more recent writers have abandoned this view of Baronius and Bellarmine, and admit the actual condemnation of Honorius by the Sixth Council.

5. And this brings us to the consideration of the said condemnation. We must compress the matter as much as possible.

In the first place, no voice regarded by Catholics as infallible ever condemned Honorius as guilty of heresy. In the second place, we admit that the Bishops of the Sixth Council did condemn Honorius of heresy. This sounds like a paradox. But there is no paradox in what we have said notwithstanding. Catholics hold that the Pope's confirmation is necessary to give force to the decisions of a General Council, and it cannot be shown that any Pope ever confirmed the condemnation of Honorius.

(1) Not Pope Agatho; for the Bishops say in their letter to that Pope: "We have slain the heretics with anathema, according to the sentence previously issued against them by your sacred letter." Now we have both the letter of Pope Agatho addressed to the Council and that addressed to the Emperor, and in neither of them is the name of Honorius mentioned.

But this is not all. In his letter to the Emperor, Pope Agatho says: "*My predecessors, thoroughly instructed as they were in the Lord's doctrine, from the time when the Constantinopolitan Patriarchs endeavoured to introduce this heretical*

novelty into Christ's spotless Church, have never neglected to exhort and entreatingly press them, that they would desist from this heretical pravity were it *only by keeping silence*." Now no other Pope except Honorius was contented with exhorting the heretical Patriarchs to *silence*; Pope Agatho, therefore, plainly had him in his mind when he wrote this passage, and yet all the same he enumerates him in the number of his predecessors who were thoroughly instructed in the Lord's doctrine. Honorius then was manifestly no heretic, in the formal sense of the word, in the eyes of Agatho when the latter Pope penned these words. When, then, the Bishops of the Council condemned Honorius as a heretic, as Dr. Ward says, they could not be the exponents of Roman contemporary opinion, expressed as it was by Pope Agatho, who by his Legates presided over the Council.

(2) Neither have the acts of the Council the claim to infallibility in respect to Honorius that they would have derived from the confirmation of Pope Leo the Second, the successor of Agatho, to whose lot it fell to confirm the acts of the Council, so far as they were confirmed. We have the confirmation of St. Leo the Second, and it is confined to the *Definition* of the Council, and does not extend to anything else. This appears from his letter to the Bishops of Spain, to whom he sent a Latin translation of the Definition, of the Prosphonic Letter, or letter of the Bishops to the Emperor, and of the Emperor's edict. He promises shortly to send the Acts. He then enjoins the Spanish Bishops to subscribe their names to the Definition, but not to the Prosphonic Letter or the Emperor's edict. "We exhort you," he says, "that by all the Reverend Bishops submission should be annexed to the Definition of the Venerable Council; and that each Prelate of Christ's churches may hasten to enrol his name in a book of life, and thus, *through the confession of his subscription*, unite as though present in spirit with ourselves and the whole Council in union of the One Evangelical and Apostolic Faith." The same declaration is to be found in the letter of St. Leo to the King of Spain and to Simplicius. The confirmation of the Pope is couched in the following terms:

"The Holy, Universal, and Sixth Great Council hath followed in all things Apostolic doctrine; and because it hath perfectly declared that Definition (*ῥπος*) of the right Faith which the Apostolic Throne of Blessed Peter . . . hath humbly

received, therefore we—and through our ministry this worshipful and Apostolic Throne—sympathize in heart and spirit with those things which *have been defined* (ὁρισθεῖσαι) thereby, and *confirm* them by the authority of Blessed Peter as (fixed) on a firm rock, which is Christ.”

Now what are the words used with respect to Honorius in this infallible decree of the Council? These :

The devil having found suitable organs for his design, Theodore, Sergius, &c., and Honorius, who was Pope of old Rome, and Cyrus, &c., did not cease to raise up by their means, against the fulness of the Church, the scandals of error of one will and one energy in the two Natures of One of the Holy Trinity, Christ our true God ; disseminating among our orthodox people by their novel language a heresy harmonizing with that of Apollinaris, &c.

And in what sense did Leo the Second confirm these words ? He tells us :

In like manner we anathematize the inventors of the new error : Theodore, Bishop of Pharan ; Cyrus of Alexandria ; Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, traitors against rather than rulers of the Constantinopolitan Church ; nay, and Honorius also, who did not labour to preserve in purity this Apostolic Church by the teaching of Apostolic tradition, but suffered the spotless to be polluted by the profane betrayal ; and likewise all who have shared in their error, &c. (Letter to the Emperor Constantine).

And in like manner he writes to the Spanish Bishops and to King Erviga :

Those who fought against the purity of Apostolic doctrine and have died, have been punished by an eternal condemnation, that is, Theodore, Cyrus, &c. ; *together with* Honorius, who did not extinguish at its outset the flame of heretical dogma, as became his Apostolic authority, but by *neglecting* fostered it.

All the *authors* of heretical assertion were cast out from the Church's unity ; Theodore, Cyrus, &c. ; and *with them*, Honorius of Rome, who consented that that undefiled rule of Apostolic tradition should be defiled, which he received from his predecessors.

These passages sufficiently fix the sense in which St. Leo assented to the condemnation of Honorius, not as being himself heretical, but for lack of duty and negligence in not at once detecting and opposing the insidious inroads of error ; for contenting himself with economical and disciplinary provisions when the clear voice and the firm hand of Peter were required.

These passages, too, bear out a remark already made, that whenever Honorius is mentioned in connection with these transactions, it is always with some qualifying clause that puts him in a different category to the rest. "Together with," "*with these*," "who allowed the purity of the Apostolic See to be spotted;" "by his *neglect* fostered and confirmed the error of the others," and so forth.

As a further instance of this, we will just mention a case in which Mr. Willis is again inaccurate. Mr. Willis says (p. 14): "It is worth observing here that the Council repeatedly speaks of the letters as *dogmatic*." The contradiction of this statement is nearer the fact. There is only one passage in which the term "dogmatic" may be applied to the letters of Honorius, and then not immediately. This instance occurs in the directions given to bring out from the Patriarchal archivium the originals of the letters of Sergius and Honorius. And even admitting that the term dogmatic is applied to the letters of Honorius, it does not in the least help Mr. Willis; for it is applied to them, if at all, in common with the letters of Sergius; and no one contends that Sergius' letters were dogmatic in the sense of their being *ex cathedrâ* documents, issued under obligation of acceptance to teach the Universal Church. But the point of the matter is that the term dogmatic while applied to other letters, might seem to have been of set purpose avoided by the Fathers of the Council in connection with the letters of Honorius. Mr. Willis in his attempt to prove that they did so apply it has simply garbled his references. Mr. Willis adds that Petavius has no hesitation in saying that Honorius *decreed* the doctrine of one operation and one will in Christ, and quotes a passage to prove his assertion. The reverse is the fact. Petavius not only does not admit that Honorius *decreed* Monothelism; he confidently denies that the Pontiff held that doctrine. In the passage quoted by Mr. Willis, Petavius does not say that Honorius *decreed* Monothelism, but that the Monothelite heretics objected to the Catholics that he decreed it; this was their allegation, not the statement of Petavius; two very different things surely. But as an example of gross blundering, and for its correction, we must trespass upon our readers' patience and produce the passage. Petavius says—

Besides, the heretics who defended the one will objected to the Catholics the authority of Honorius, the Roman Pontiff, who decreed that there was both one operation in Christ and one will.

Now, what does the following sentence in Petavius say ?

But this stain of error has been wiped away from him in the twenty-first chapter of the first book, where the craft of the Monothelites is exposed, who referred what the Pontiff had said in reply to Sergius, the prime leader in this heresy, concerning the two wills of the same human nature, to the Divine and human will, as if he had rejected the human and retained only the Divine ; when he had rather rejected the carnal will implanted by the fault of the first man, and admitted in Christ only that will that was subject to reason, and by no means that which was contrary.

In other words, Petavius gives precisely our own explanation of the words of Honorius, "We confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ." And Petavius insists still more strongly on this view in the thirteenth chapter of his first book on the Incarnation.

(3) But it may be urged : Well, these explanations may be all very good, but the fact still remains, that in the acts and acclamation of the Sixth Synod, Honorius was proclaimed a heretic. How can you account even for this on any theory of Papal Infallibility ?

(4) In answer to this we will quote a passage from Dr. Ward's pamphlet, in which he sums up the doctrine of Dr. Murray¹⁶ on a question directly bearing on the subject.

"Can the Pontiff become a formal heretic?" Bannez, Valentian, and Laymann, he tells us, answer in the affirmative : Tanner and Viva think the thing uncertain ; Bellarmine and Wiggers account it probable—Suarez thinks it more probable—that God will not permit this. He cites no one theologian who considers it *certain* that a Pope may not be a formal heretic ; though he holds (most reasonably, we think) that the fact of no such circumstance having occurred for so many centuries, affords much increased probability to the opinion. Lastly, Dr. Murray mentions, as admitted by all, that a Pope may fall materially into dogmatic error, and even into heresy.¹⁷

Let us then suppose the case of a Pope lapsing into material or even formal heresy, though the ever-increasing results of historical investigation render the supposition a difficult one ; difficult in proportion to the difficulty of pointing to any one Pope in the past who has so fallen. But supposing the case to happen, what then ? What weight would such a case have as against the doctrine of Papal Infallibility ? Simply none, unless

¹⁶ *De Ecclesia*, d. 20, n. 108.

¹⁷ Ward, p. 8.

it could be shown that such heresy had been embodied in an *ex cathedrâ* definition. Thus those who urge the case of Honorius in disproof of the dogma of Papal Infallibility, entirely fail unless they can allege some definite tenet admitted to be heretical that Honorius has set forth as obligatory on the belief of the Universal Church, and therefore of all Christians.

But no such allegation is capable of certain proof, nay, of any proof whatsoever. For if Honorius did impose any such erroneous tenet, what is it? Not the one will in the Monothelite sense; certainly not the one operation in the same sense: in fact, no imposition of doctrine can be pointed out such as the case requires. Honorius abstained from defining anything; that is on the very face of the case, considered in its length and breadth; he only counselled an economical silence.

And again, if even such definite tenet could be shown in Honorius' letters, the total absence of the marks that ought to distinguish an *ex cathedrâ* decision would deprive it of its force as a weapon against the Papal Infallibility as defined by the Vatican Council.

Let us admit then that Honorius was a material or formal heretic (though we trust that we have sufficiently shown that this is a proposition quite devoid of proof), and that he was branded as a heretic in consequence by the Sixth Council. All that we need say in that case is, that the Council would be within its competency in doing so, as there is nothing to prevent any one from holding the opinion that a Pope may hold heretical opinions, though the present tendency of theological thought, backed by the development of historical evidence, be against the probability of such a case ever occurring.

But we think sufficient evidence has been produced to show that the condemnation of Honorius by the Sixth Council did not take this extreme form; that Honorius not being a formal nor even a material heretic, the condemnation could not touch him in such a shape. When, then, Honorius was condemned as a heretic, we must accept the term as covering that amount of indirect encouragement that he gave to the Monothelite heresy by not at once detecting the true bearings of Sergius' crafty letter, and wielding the power of Peter to check the mischief in its beginnings. Indeed, taking into consideration the whole details and surroundings of the case, no other conclusion is possible. Honorius could only be condemned according to the measure of his shortcomings; and there is nothing

to show that he was a heretic even in the material sense of the word.

Then, again, the condemnation of the Council is general. No definite propositions in Honorius' letters are submitted to the judgment of the Council; his letters are only condemned in their general tenor; and it was quite fair to say that they by not definitely condemning, or even by want of clearness of exposition, favoured the progress of the Monothelite heresy in the East.

But failing space requires us to bring these remarks to an end. Of course in so wide a subject they have not been exhaustive; but enough has been said, we trust, to show the ground on which Catholics stand with respect to Honorius; and also to suggest the extreme inconvenience, to say the least of it, of persons venturing to discuss so grave a topic without some amount of theological training to qualify them for the task.

There are many other points that we might have noticed; for example, stress is laid on the reiteration of the condemnation of Honorius by the Seventh and Eighth Councils. Let it be enough to say that it can be shown that these Councils do not and cannot go beyond the Sixth in the measure of their condemnation of the Pope.

One more remark: the motive of this controversy is the dogma of the Papal Infallibility. Well, we know of no stronger historical proofs of the position of the Pope with reference to the Universal Church, and of his official infallibility than those supplied by the acts of the Sixth General Council. These each one may find in plenty by reading the acts for himself.

The task of defending Pope Honorius has been a grateful one; for though he fell into difficulties, and entailed difficulties on his defenders to the end of time, by indulging in the spirit of compromise in a matter of deep religious principle (and we all know, and none better than our Anglican friends, what compromises of that kind lead to), he yet has special claims upon the respectful remembrance of Englishmen. We will let Father Bottalla sum up these claims for us.

In this country the memory of Pope Honorius should be held in immortal honour, and his name arouse feelings of veneration and gratitude. He was the happy heir of the glorious work begun by the great Gregory on behalf of this nation. He encouraged with his paternal letters Edwin, the powerful King of Northumbria, to hold out in defence of Christianity against the swelling tide of paganism, and to bear in

mind the affection and instructions given by his illustrious predecessor. He it was that confirmed with his Apostolic words Paulinus, who had been sent by St. Gregory to preach to the Northumbrians; and he it was that rewarded the Saint for his glorious success with the pallium. It was this great Pope that consoled and supported the missionaries occupied with the conversion of the Angles and East Saxons, and in an especial manner his namesake Honorius, Archbishop of Canterbury, who was at the head of that evangelical enterprize, and who also deserved to receive the pallium at the hands of the same Pontiff. Moreover, whilst he laboured to give new vigour to Christianity in these parts of England where it had been already introduced by the zeal of St. Gregory, he did not forget the portion of the Saxon nation which was still lying in the darkness of paganism. He sent a new apostle, Birinus, to preach the Gospel to the warlike people of Wessex, and to withstand the idolatry of Mercia, which threatened to overflow and sweep away Christianity from the north and the east of the island. Bede, the most learned man who appeared among the Saxons in the seventh and eighth century, knew well how to appreciate the virtues of Pope Honorius. In his Ecclesiastical History of the English nation he represented Honorius as a perfect pastor; but in the life of the Abbot Bertolf he speaks at length in his praise. He calls him a holy and venerable Pontiff, clear-sighted and resolute, illustrious for his learning, and of remarkable meekness and humility. And although in his work *De Ratione Temporum* he mentions his condemnation by the Sixth Synod, he abstains from adding any remark whatever tending to cast a slur on the memory of the Pontiff.¹⁸

Plainly then, Pope Honorius has some claim upon us as one to whose endeavours we, in a considerable measure, owe the gift of the faith and the evangelization of England; may this feeble attempt to vindicate his memory stand as some trifling discharge of the debt.

THOMAS B. PARKINSON.

¹⁸ *Pope Honorius*, p. 138.

A "Pleasant Party at Windsor."

THE readers of the Introduction prefixed by Mr. Allies to the two volumes lately published by him, *Per Crucem ad Lucem*, may remember his description of his surprise and alarm at discovering that, beyond all doubt, the source of jurisdiction in the Anglican Church is the Sovereign and no one else. It is, indeed, a pity that so many among the high-minded and earnest men who are content to serve the Establishment because they happen to have been born and educated within its boundaries, should be so ignorant as to the history of its foundation and the principles on which its existence depends. It might have been thought that the Prayer-Book and Articles, taken together, would have been enough to enlighten any one as to this last point. But it is not so. Just as a great number of Anglicans take their ideas as to the Sacrament of the Eucharist from the plain meaning of our Lord's own words, and forget how carefully that plain meaning is denied in the Rubrics of the Anglican Communion Office, which teach in so many words the doctrine of the "Real Absence"—so a great number of the members of the same Community take their ideas of spiritual jurisdiction, and orders, and the like, from what they find in ancient Church histories and in the writings of Christian Doctors, instead of consulting the Acts of Parliament and the authentic formularies and decisions of the Courts within the Anglican Establishment.

The lately published *Life of "Bishop" Selwyn*, the first Anglican Bishop of New Zealand, who ended his days as Bishop of Lichfield in the course of 1878, contains an amusing instance of the alarm of a simple and earnest-minded Christian, not perhaps very learned, but with a great many good instincts, on finding himself confronted for the first time with the real principles of Anglicanism. George Augustus Selwyn was appointed Bishop of New Zealand in 1841, when Lord Stanley

afterwards the late Lord Derby, was Colonial Minister, though his appointment had been already nearly determined upon by Lord John Russell, who had held the same post in the Ministry of Lord Melbourne. Mr. Selwyn had some difficulty at first, insomuch as the new Colonial Minister had heard that he was a "firebrand," and had written some savage articles in the *Quarterly* "about Roman Catholics, and especially the Jesuits." It turned out that his name was mistaken for that of the late Mr. William Sewell, and it is certainly creditable to the Lord Stanley of the day that he should have hesitated over the appointment under such a misapprehension. But this was only the first and the slightest difficulty. When the Letters Patent came to be prepared, according to the precedents of the Anglican Establishment in such cases, Mr. Selwyn, as we are informed by his biographer, "was shocked at their profanity. A statement of objections drawn up after consultation with Doctors Hope and Badeley [both of whom afterwards became Catholics], was sent in to the authorities, but received no attention. The Bishop-designate then sought an interview with the Crown lawyers, and succeeded in carrying most of the points for which he chiefly cared, especially that his Patent should not be revocable at the pleasure of the Sovereign, a hyper-Papal assumption of power which had been tolerated in all previous documents of the kind, and to this day is to be found in the few remaining cases in which Bishops in Crown Colonies, having no local legislatures, are still possessed of Letters Patent." . . . The biographer whom we are quoting then tells us that Mr. Selwyn succeeded in having the nomination of his Archdeacons placed in his own hands—but, he adds, "Another expression still more offensive he was unable to get removed. He was anxious to get rid of the Erastian expression of the Queen 'giving him power to ordain'—the profanity of which is only equalled by its absurdity; but the Crown lawyers were inexorable, and the Letters Patent—which have since been declared to be utterly valueless—were issued with the offensive clause in the full face of its impotent assumption. Against this preposterous clause the Bishop could only protest, and this he did formally, in a document which is probably among the archives of the Colonial Office. 'I think it right, in expressing my readiness to accept the Patent as now framed, to state to your lordship, that, whatever meaning the words of it may be construed to bear, I conceive that those

functions which are merely spiritual are conveyed to the Bishop by the act of consecration alone.'"¹

It is certainly not our business, nor our desire, to examine what the exact meaning of the words may be to which Selwyn so naturally objected on grounds of common Christian sense. Nor need we inquire whether he should have accepted the Patent at all with words in it against which he felt bound to protest. The protest, probably, made little impression enough on Lord Stanley, who perhaps "whistled" when he read it, as he did when he heard that it was Sewell and not Selwyn who had written the offensive article in the *Quarterly Review*. But we cannot help remembering that, many years after this time, Selwyn was made, by special command, we believe, of her Majesty Queen Victoria, Bishop of Lichfield, and that, in his new capacity he must have done homage to the Queen on his appointment, as an essential condition of his entering on the possession of his new see. Now, Mr. Allies has told us, on the unquestionable and unquestioned authority of Lord Russell, quoting the words of the oath taken by the Anglican Bishops on their knees before the Sovereign on such occasions, that they solemnly swear that they "hold the spiritualities as well as the temporalities of their sees" of that Sovereign alone. It would be interesting to know whether any shadow of a scruple as to these words, of which we may fairly say, in the language of Bishop Selwyn's biographers, that their profanity is only equalled by their absurdity, crossed the mind of George Augustus Selwyn when he prepared to kneel before his sovereign lady the Queen on the occasion referred to. It may appear to some that it might have been better not to parade that praiseworthy amount of independence which Selwyn certainly showed when he was appointed to a Colonial bishopric, unless it could have been shown that in his maturer years, when he came to be appointed to the comparatively higher dignity and emoluments of an English see, he distinguished himself from his episcopal compeers by making some objection or protest, with respect to the act of abject servility which is exacted of all Anglican prelates before they are put in possession of their temporalities.

It is hardly necessary to say, that if any scruple of the kind of which we speak had crossed the mind of the subject of the biography before us, we ought to have heard of it, and we

¹ *Life of Bishop Selwyn*, vol. i. p. 72.

should have heard of it, from the writer of that biography. But there is nothing of the kind said, and it is evident enough that there was nothing of the kind to say. The account of Selwyn's acceptance of the bishopric of Lichfield is to be found in the second volume, and it is simple enough. Selwyn declined Lord Derby's offer, or rather, the offer of the offer, of the vacant bishopric, when that offer was first made, on many very good grounds, mentioning that when he had left New Zealand a report had been spread that he did not intend to return, to which he had replied that "nothing but illness or death would prevent me." As a matter of fact, he did return for a short visit, but only after having taken possession of the English see of Lichfield. His reluctance was partly overcome by the Archbishop of Canterbury, but he tells us, ingenuously enough, that that would not have been enough if the Queen had not laid her commands upon him. It is worth while to quote his words, which show that he did not obey the Queen as Sovereign, but as Head of the Church of England. "I am a man under authority," he says to the Archbishop. "*As a matter of promotion conferred by the civil power,*"² I had no hesitation in refusing the bishopric of Lichfield. My love for New Zealand made me hope that the offer would not be renewed. But I do not wish to give undue weight even to that feeling, because the strength of my attachment may mislead me." It was, therefore, a strong attachment, not a duty, which bound him to his see. "I am commanded to preach at Windsor on Sunday (December 1), and the Dean's letter leads me to think that the Queen may speak to me on the subject. *As a soldier of the Church I shall probably feel bound to do whatever my commander-in-chief bids me.*"

What a solution is here offered for all the troubles of the Establishment! If the "commander-in-chief" would but "speak on the subject," say of vestments, and genuflections, and incense, and wafer bread, and the like, to the faithful "soldiers of the Church, under her obedience"—Mr. Mackonochie and the rest of them! How much more easy than all the machinery of Lord Penzance and his new court, and his monitions, and suspensions, and the like! Lord Beaconsfield is accused of having introduced "personal government" into our Constitutional practice, where it is not only an innovation, but the restoration of a discarded and obsolete power. Why will he not think of introducing it into its proper and legitimate place, the govern-

² The italics are ours.

ment of the Establishment? Let the blandishments of royalty be tried on these recalcitrant Ritualists. Let Mr. Mackonochie be commanded to preach at Windsor, and be summoned to the royal "closet" afterwards, and have the pleasure which Selwyn had of dining "with her Majesty and Princess Louise"—it would be Princess Beatrice now—"a small party of eight, and very pleasant." Depend upon it, the experiment might be worth trying. If Mr. Mackonochie is a man of principle and personal goodness, so was Selwyn. It was not that he was less high-principled or less good when he accepted Lichfield than when he accepted the royal patent for New Zealand, but that he found out, in maturer years, that he was a "soldier" of the Establishment, and bound to obey his "commander-in-chief."

And so he went and knelt to her Majesty and swore, like a good obedient soldier as he was, that he "did acknowledge and confess to have and to hold the bishopric of Lichfield, and the possession of the same entirely, as well the spiritualities as the temporalities thereof, only of her Majesty, and so help him God and the contents of that holy Book." He threw the grains of incense on the altar of Jupiter Anglicanus, and all was well. Now, let us not be supposed to throw a doubt on the honesty of this good man. We may think that there was a little chuckle in certain quarters over the success of the scheme for getting him to stay in England after his tremendous protestations of loyalty to his distant "Bride," the Church of New Zealand. It is possible that the Queen and Princess had a little silvery laughter over the taming of the "friend of the savage;" it may be that Lord Derby once more "whistled," and perhaps even the Archbishop of Canterbury may have stroked his most reverend nose with his fore finger with all the decorum befitting a "lineal successor of St. Augustine." But no one can doubt the honesty of George Augustus Selwyn. Nay, more, in our opinion, he did what he ought to have done—supposing him to have any business to figure as a "bishop" of the Establishment at all. The Queen is the Pope of Anglicanism, and there can be no doubt that, if the Pope were to tell a Catholic bishop in the Colonies that he would like him to accept a see in England, the Catholic bishop would do well to obey his "commander-in-chief." Anglicans are very fond of imagining that, because the royal power in this country has lost its political supremacy, it has also therefore lost its ecclesiastical supremacy. It is not so—as the oath of the Anglican "bishops" when they

do homage sufficiently proves. We do not venture to interpret the consciences of these respectable persons, but we may venture to say that, as George Augustus Selwyn had so strongly protested against the Queen giving him power to ordain, he must have meant something else than the power of ordination by the spiritualities which he acknowledged on oath that he held only of her Majesty. He must of course have meant something, or he would have been guilty of taking an oath in vain. What he may have meant, what he must have meant, as far as we can see, was this—that he held of the Queen alone his whole "jurisdiction" as bishop. Anglicans of Dr. Pusey's school are fond of talking, what is nonsense in their mouths, about "jurisdiction" inherent in the see of this or that city. Their bishops contradict them on oath. They hold their jurisdiction of the Queen alone.

The Anglican theory is quite plain, and we commend it in all seriousness to the Ritualists and the High Churchmen. Mr. Mackonochie will not submit to Lord Penzance, who represents "a lay power," because a certain Bishop of London conferred on him spiritual jurisdiction over the flock of St. Alban's, Holborn. Well, and where did the Bishop of London get his jurisdiction, that he might impart it to Mr. Mackonochie? Not by any personal caprice, or in consequence of any erroneous judgment of his own in the matter, not as a private person, but as a prelate of the Establishment acting, in the most solemn matter and manner possible, in obedience to the fundamental law of that Establishment, on his knees before the Head of his Church, and calling God solemnly to witness that he was ready to forfeit his salvation if his words were not true—the Bishop who conferred jurisdiction on Mr. Mackonochie declared that he held the see of London, its spiritualities and temporalities alike,—“only of your Majesty.”

*"The Metaphysics of the School."*¹

OUR readers are aware that Father Harper has lately given them some very sound reasoning to prove the immense importance to an age, a generation, a nation, of the character of its philosophy. We need not repeat what has been so well said. If there was ever a time when it was all important to set up a true and high standard in the matter in question, surely the time in which we live is such a time. The fecundity of our literature is immense, though we are obliged to confess that it is a very shallow fecundity after all. Such as it is, however, it serves the purpose of feeding such minds as the men of England in the nineteenth century have to cultivate, and it affects their action in public and private, in the affairs of this world and of the next. To say that literature is good of its kind is one thing, to say that it influences the men of the day quite as much as if it were the best of its kind is another, and this at least we must claim for the poor stuff of which the greater part of our literature is made up. But the influence of literature is good or bad according to the dominant philosophy on which it is practically based. Nor is it only in literature that a good or a bad philosophy is influential. It affects practice and conduct in a thousand ways without any reference to literature at all. The dominant philosophy of England is not good of its kind, and its effects and its influence are of the same kind with itself.

We hear a great deal continually of the necessity of higher education, though our efforts in that direction have been lacking in many of the elements necessary for success. But it is not always remembered that the higher education which we want, and which alone will save us from the great danger which is pressing upon us, of seeing our young men and young women—for they too must be counted in, in the days in which we live,

¹ *The Metaphysics of the School.* By Thomas Harper, S.J. Vol. I. Macmillans, London, 1879.

when there is question of true higher education—swept away in the vortex of a false philosophy of life and of the world, must be an education that, in its ultimate extension and influence, must reach all classes alike of the community in their degree. It would be well, indeed, if we could so combine our forces and so extend our opportunities, as to afford easily, to all of the higher classes, a good system of fundamental philosophical training. That would be a great gain, and the extent of its importance can only be measured by those who know what it is to see youth after youth of promise and capacity and, what is more, of innocence of life and purity of aim, lost to religion and probably to morality also, as soon as he comes up to London to work for some of the professions, to prepare for a competitive examination, to enter the army, and the like. Why is this? It is because the ordinary *curriculum* of a Catholic youth stops at the higher class of the school at which he is educated, and he is thrown on the world to read whatever he finds before him, on all the burning questions of the day, in religion and philosophy, without having had the slightest instruction, or the opportunity of gaining the slightest instruction, in Catholic philosophy. He might as well be sent to fight in the field in a modern European struggle with an old "Brown Bess" and a very scanty supply of ammunition. We say it is well if we can do something towards providing the higher class of our young men with a good course of philosophy. But if we could do this, to an extent which would gladden the hearts of many who have been saddened almost to despair by the repeated hindrances which are ever rising up in the way of any attempt at general improvement in this matter, we should still be only at the beginning of our work. For wherever there is thought and study, there must be a philosophy of some sort, to be the foundation of that study and the guide of that thought. And, as the progress of education has now made literature and all its rich fields the property of all instead of a few, it follows that we must not be content till we have a popular philosophy which is as accessible to all as our literature itself. Literature of all sorts is now open to all classes alike. All classes alike, therefore, require that training which will enable them to benefit by what they read, and not to be poisoned by it.

Every one knows that the false philosophy of the day injures many a well-to-do young Catholic, and is bringing on the danger of our seeing in England what was once the reproach of the

Catholicism of the Continent, that is, of seeing our holy faith and the practices of our religion confined to the ministers of the altar, to religious persons, and to women and children. But it must be remembered that for one young gentleman who is spoilt by the poison of which we speak, there are ten or a score of intelligent youths of lower rank, who will not be debarred from literature, and who have minds and souls as good as his. The hope of the Church is ever in the masses of the population, and she can never think her work done for her till the masses are provided with the mental food which is requisite to save them from ruin, and to guide them on to the rich treasures which they are meant by Providence to find in the fields of knowledge. We want something more than a College or two for the upper and upper middle classes, in which sound philosophy may be taught. We want something that will bring home, even to the lower orders, the opportunities, at least, of learning the elements of good philosophy. We hear of Latin and perhaps Greek being taught, even in the schools of the children of the poor in some of our towns, and no doubt the strain which has been introduced into the educational struggle as regards the children of the poor by the institution of the Board Schools, will work itself out in the adoption of a much larger number of subjects of study than heretofore. But the time will come, as we hope, though we may now expect to be laughed at for anticipating such a future, when the intelligent artisan who now reads Huxley and Bain, and a dozen such sophists, in good faith, and drinks in their poison without being able to detect it, will have been furnished, by his own education, with the antidote, or, rather, with the preventive, to the mischief, by having had a good grounding in sound philosophy. We hope to see the day when there may be, in all our great towns at least, opportunities for any one who desires it, to hear lectures and attend classes in mental philosophy, as well as in those subjects of science, as it is so strangely, because so exclusively, called, which now are included in the ordinary range of the knowledge of educated persons.

Such opportunities would be no novelty in the Church, except that in our days centres of instruction would have to be indefinitely multiplied, beyond the precedent of the middle ages. The educational work of the middle ages was by no means confined to the great Universities. And, after the Reformation had done its work of mischief, the Church exerted

herself, very mainly by the instrumentality of the Society of Jesus, to bring good and high education home to the doors of the people in the great towns. Those who have had the privilege of frequenting, in past years, the schools of the great Roman College at Rome, and listening to the first professors of the day on theology or philosophy, may be able to speak of the character of the absolutely gratuitous instruction there given. But they may not have observed that the classes were open to all without distinction, and they may not have found, as the writer of this paper has found, that the sons of tradesmen whom they may have come across could speak Latin, and give as good an account of a thesis or a disputation in philosophy as themselves. There is no reason why this should not be the case in many a great centre. It is to be supposed that no impediment would be put, by any one who has a word to say in such matters, to the development of educational enterprise for the glory of God. That being granted, it may be assumed that as the need is brought more and more home to the great educational bodies, their readiness to undertake the good work will only be limited by their means of supplying good teachers for the purpose. As for the students, it is not likely that in any large centre of Catholic population, they will be wanting. They were not wanting in the middle ages, they were not wanting in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The religious body of which we just now spoke as having had so large a part in the education of those centuries had many difficulties to encounter. It had to fight constantly against jealousies and rivalries, not altogether unintelligible, when it is remembered that the schools of the Society were open to all comers without charge, and the other schools, which had the monopoly before the Society was instituted, did not all teach for nothing. The Society, as we have said, had all sorts of difficulties to contend with, except one—that of finding pupils. We are confident that it would be so again, if the same sort of teaching, by whatever agency or instrumentality, was brought home to the populations of our great towns. And we venture to say that the opening of a good Catholic College, with well-trained masters, anywhere in the midst of such populations, would not only save the souls of hundreds of Catholics, but would help a great many more hundreds of Protestants to the knowledge of the truth.

There is enough mental indolence in the days in which we live, in all conscience, but there is also, happily, a great deal

of mental activity. Mr. Gladstone has lately told the world how many of the students of the University of Glasgow are men who have to work for their livelihood as well as attend the classes of the University. These are his words :

Through the kindness, however, of your Principal and your Professor of Humanity, seconded by the intelligent willingness of his students, I have been allowed the privilege of a nearer insight into the structure of your academic society. It is with the deepest interest and pleasure that I place upon record the main heads of knowledge thus attained : Of 647 students in the humanity class, information has actually been obtained as follows from no less than 580 ; of these 229 are studying with a view to the ministry, 106 for the profession of teachers, 110 for the law ; for medicine no more than 38 are in the humanity class, 23 for various branches of business, and 74 are as yet undetermined. Of these I am informed it is probable that a large proportion will enter on some of the walks of commercial life. Still more interesting than this exhibition of the connection between the greatest among the professions and the pursuit of general culture is the view—I will say the deeply touching view—of the amount of resolute, unsparing personal effort through which alone it is that the youth of Scotland come to the benefits of academic training. These are not the children of wealth and ease, grudging whatever is given to study as stolen from luxury and amusement. They are the hardy offspring of a hardy land, who win by toiling the privilege of further toil, and in their cumulating effort give a double strength to the fibre of their faculties and their will. Of 590 students who may be taken, I understand, fairly to represent the average of the University, about one-third, or more exactly 199, are so far independent in their means that they are not diverted from their academic work by any other occupation ; but there are no less than 391, or two-thirds of the whole, who keep their place in the University, almost in all cases, by one form or another of private employment, added on through the whole or a portion of the year to the burden of their studies ; 240 are thus engaged in extraneous work both during the session and throughout the summer : 135, without doubling their task during the session, are variously employed in the summer ; the remaining 16 join a business to their academic pursuits in the winter. The intending lawyers are clerks in writers' offices ; some of the intending teachers are engaged as pupils in training colleges ; some youths are exercised in mission work ; the remainder, says Professor Ramsay, are distributed over every conceivable kind of employment. In the humanity class this year are included joiners, miners, brassfounders, bootmakers, tailors, grocers, engineers, shipbuilders, drapers, stewards of steamers, a toll-keeper—who may I suppose, well be said to levy toll first of all upon himself—a pocket-book maker, a blacksmith, and others. Of this statement I will only say that I do not know, and hardly can conceive, one more full of promise for the future of your country.

We hear on all sides of the increase at Oxford of the "unattached students"—the men who cannot afford to live in the Colleges or Halls, but who nevertheless are not undistinguished members of that ancient University. We feel no manner of doubt, that the salvation of the rising generation will ere long be seen to lie in the very great extension of higher education, in the proper sense of the term, to classes which have hitherto been considered to be outside the range of its possible acquirement. As soon as the need is really acknowledged, the other difficulties which now beset the development of which we speak, will soon vanish of themselves. What is there in mental philosophy that should make it a sealed book to all but the easy classes? What is there in it to make the mechanic or the labourer unfit for its study, when he is allowed to learn half a dozen "ologies" in his Board School? The whole field of knowledge is to be opened to him, forsooth, except that one part of knowledge which is essential as the foundation and the security of the rest! Give him a true philosophy, and he will either remain faithful to the true religion or he will be on the way to find it. Teach him his Catechism, and it is well. He can go to Heaven without philosophy. But if he is to be trained to range at will over the whole field of literature and science, he must have the key to reasoning and science put into his hand. He must be armed against the sophisms he will be sure to meet, and he can only be so armed as to be able to give himself and others a good account of them, by some sound knowledge of philosophy.

If this be true, as we believe it to be most true, what are we to say to a man who, in these days of discouragement and disappointment, endeavours to put before the English reader a lucid and complete system of Catholic philosophy? Certainly we can say nothing but good of his enterprize in itself. He deserves, merely for attempting such a thing, the thanks of the Catholic community, as the Roman Consul, who, after the battle of Cannæ, was thanked for not despairing of the Republic. The cause of which this man has not despaired is something greater than the cause even of the Republic of Rome—it is the cause of truth and knowledge, the cause with which the interests of humanity are bound up, it is in no small measure the cause of the Church herself. It is an intense relief in this age of pettiness and timidity, even in spheres from which such miseries should be for ever strangers, to find a man who is not afraid to

spend years of study on the very foundations of philosophy, and to ask the world to listen to the result of his labours. What a contrast to the touting educationists of the day, of whatever school or colour, with their dainty little bills of fare of "commercial education," "wants of the age," "requirements of modern society," and the like—as if the men of the nineteenth century had no souls to save or minds to train, like the generations before them. *Non ragioriam di lor, ma guarda, e passa.*

All thanks, therefore, to Father Harper, for the work he has undertaken. He cannot look for any great or rapid appreciation at the hands of the public in general. He must be content, as many others who have to labour in the cause of truth must be content, if he can influence, and, to some extent, train those who are to influence others. He writes directly to those who are able and willing to listen to an exposition, necessarily long and often abstruse, of the forgotten philosophy of the Catholic schools, at which every one is ready to throw a stone, except those who know something about it. He is not a writer who deals in the popular and the shallow. He has a good power of illustration, which will often, in the pages now before us, relieve the flagging attention of his readers. He knows his matter well, and is content not to be original. All this ought to go to make his labours less unacceptable than they might otherwise be to the general reader. But the general reader will hardly be attracted to the subject of the philosophy of the School. All true and deep labourers in the cause of truth on the field of literature at present lie under great disadvantages, partly from their enemies and partly from their friends, of which we had something to say in our last issue. But the labourer in the field of Catholic metaphysics has an amount of prejudice to overcome before he can procure a hearing, which is almost unexampled, and then, when he has gained a hearing, he has to face the difficulty of his subject and the indolence engendered in his readers by the effeminate manners of a day which hates all mental exertion, and this difficulty, again, is peculiar in its degree to this subject. We can only rejoice that a man has been found to undertake the task. And, having said this, we have to add that it is an additional subject of rejoicing that he has done it so well. A book like that before us is a necessity, if there is ever to be a good Catholic philosophy in England. It may be that the text book of the future will be something else, but it will be founded on this, and its author will have to

become a disciple of the writer of whom we are now speaking. It is too early in the day to say what will be the effect of a book like this. It must have time to make its way, and to be considered and studied by the few men in England, at present, who are capable of forming a sound opinion upon it. But it is hardly premature to hope that it will long remain a book which will be valued by those who have to teach others, and to assert that its appearance will be a turning point in the history of philosophy in this country. But the best way of making our readers able to judge as to this will be to give some short account of the contents of the volume.

The work before us begins with a long and interesting Introduction, in which the plan and scope of the whole is very clearly explained. Father Harper stops on his way, at the outset, to remove certain obvious prejudices and misconceptions, which he finds set forth in the works of Hobbes, Mosheim, and others of the same class. We need not ourselves linger over this part of the Introduction, which is occasionally very amusing. We may suppose our own readers to be sufficiently loyal to the philosophy of the Church—for the School in this matter represents the Church—to be disinclined to believe that the philosophy in question is to be altogether discarded on the score of "barbarous terminology," a "total want of classical style," or again, because its style is "so dry and impoverished." Nor again, need we be at the pains to point out, after Father Harper, that the subject-matter of his philosophy cannot be called "altogether incomprehensible," that the method of the scholastics is not "opposed to common sense," that they are not perpetually wrangling over "useless questions," and working to death "worthless abstractions." The next part of the Introduction is more directly interesting to us, because it deals with obstacles which beset a writer in Father Harper's position, on account of the prevalent inexactness of thought in the men of to-day, of their contempt for the past and their exaggerated notions of their intellectual independence, on account of their ignorance of the difficulty of the subject-matter of metaphysics, and on account of the adverse tendencies of the tone of mind engendered by physical and mathematical studies. As to this last point, it is often too true that mathematicians as such are a shallow race, and that the study of physics tends to make the mind find an exclusive satisfaction in positive and scientific proofs alone. But we should be sorry to think that, in themselves, these

studies had any effect which ought to be inimical to the processes of thought which belong to higher philosophy. But no one will deny to Father Harper the truth of his main proposition, that he has certain very hostile elements to meet in the undertaking to which he has devoted himself.

We pass on to the explanation of the plan and object of the book which now follows. Father Harper, as we have said, does not aim at originality. All the same, he cannot help being to some extent an original writer. He is anything but a mere echo of the opinion of his master, and, as to the character of a cursist or an epitomist, his readers well know that it is an abomination in his eyes. The book, he tells us, "professes to give in English, to the best of the author's ability, the fundamental philosophy of the School, which will be found to differ little, if at all, from that of Aristotle." What this philosophy is he has found mainly in the works of St. Thomas, who, though he wrote no distinct treatise on metaphysics, has commented on the metaphysics of Aristotle, and has left a number of treatises or *Opuscula*, besides his great *Summa*, from which his opinions may be gathered. It was not till after the Council of Trent, that Catholic writers began to compose formal works on metaphysics, and of the famous volumes of Suarez, bearing this title, Father Harper has made great use. The metaphysics of Suarez were written for theological students, and in a work like the present that special object could not be kept in view as the end to be aimed at above all others. The author has adopted the arrangement of Suarez as the basis of his own work. "I propose," he says, "that the entire work should consist of nine books. The first treats of the Definition of metaphysics, the second of Being, the third of the transcendental attributes of Being. These three books complete the present volume. In the fourth book will be considered the principles of Being, in the fifth the causes of Being, in the sixth the primary determinations of Being, in the seventh and eighth the categories of Aristotle, in the ninth natural theology."

Father Harper then tells us that he has omitted, out of the multitude of questions before him, all that could fairly be called subordinate, and all those also which are connected with supernatural theology. This has enabled him to avoid the greater part of the questions which formed the battlefield for contending schools. For many obvious reasons, the doctrine of St. Thomas has been selected as the one doctrine to be

followed—but Father Harper does not deny that he has followed that interpretation of St. Thomas which prevails in the schools of his own Order. When he comes to speak of the form of the work, he tells us that he would gladly, on many accounts, have followed St. Thomas also in his method, but that he has been obliged to choose rather the now common way of theses and propositions. The Introduction concludes with some amusing protests against the common cry for an Index, which he does not intend to gratify, for very good reasons, and with the mention of the glossary of terms which is to be found in the last pages of the volume. The author apologizes for the dryness and difficulty of this the first instalment of his work, and promises the diligent reader something more attractive in the second volume. "The second volume, which will comprise the fourth and fifth books, includes subjects of more general interest, such as a survey and discussion of the philosophy of Kant, an estimate of some of the more important points in the logic of Sir William Hamilton, an elaborate exposition and defence of the Scholastic teaching with regard to the primary constituents of bodies, a defence of the principle of causality, with answers to the objections which have been brought against it, the doctrine touching efficient and final causation." This is a very attractive bill of fare, and we sincerely hope that we shall soon see it actually presented to the reader.

It is of course inevitable that a book like this should be called dry, and that the author may be charged with assuming too much knowledge in his readers, with dwelling too long on abstruse points, and with failing to make the matter he has in hand intelligible or popular. But no one will deny the loftiness of the aim of the book, nor, we think, will any one question the felicity of many of Father Harper's illustrations. We believe—but here few can speak with absolute authority, and certainly not the present writer—that the author will be found to have faithfully adhered to his modest programme as to doctrine, and that the volume, as far as it goes, will not be blamed for any digression from the fundamental philosophy which it undertakes to represent. This of itself is a great boon. So the volume will stand or fall, according to the readiness or unwillingness of the minds of the more studious part of our countrymen to listen to a fair exposition of the philosophy of the Schools. We believe that it will at once put a stop to a good deal of nonsense, which might perhaps, as in times past, have been

said about the Scholastic philosophy. That, at all events, will be something. A museum might be half filled with the ludicrous and impertinent remarks on the Scholastic philosophy by writers, even of considerable merit in other respects, who have known, to say the simple truth, nothing of what they were talking about. We shall hope, also, that this work will make its way to the seats of learning and thought, as far as there can be said in our time to be any such seats, among our Protestant fellow-countrymen. Then it will leaven many a mind, and prevent, perhaps, many an intellectual ruin. But we have a still greater hope, that it may stimulate the activity of the Catholic students among us—that it may not only be accomplished in the goodly proportions which Father Harper desires to give to it, but that it may be the forerunner of future writings of the same scope and aim—the beginning and the foundation of an English school of Catholic philosophy.

Catholic Review.

I.—NOTES ON THE PRESS.

1.—THE PRESENT STATE OF THE FRENCH CHURCH.

SOME time ago it was our business to draw attention to a pamphlet published in France by the Abbé Bougaud, on the great peril which, as he conceived, was besetting the Church in that country. The pamphlet received a considerable amount of interest in England, and its statements of facts were taken for granted by ourselves as well as by other writers who commented upon them. We are not now going to re-open the questions which were raised in our remarks, as to which last we see no reason for any modification. But we are bound to let our readers know that the state of the French Church, in one important particular, that of the numbers of its clergy, appears to be more satisfactory than it was stated to be by the Abbé Bougaud. This has been pointed out by a writer to whom we have had occasion, before now, to refer—the Abbé Martin, whose article on the "Present State of the French Church" in the December number of the *Nineteenth Century* will be found extremely interesting as well as full of information.

The truth as to the number of the French clergy seems to be, that it had been reduced to the lowest possible state before the beginning of this century, when it is a fair and liberal calculation to rate the number of priests at 20,000. In 1817 this number seems to have been increased by half. The following table gives the increase in the period which has since elapsed :

No.	Year	Cures	Succursales	Vicariats	Sum	Increase	Decrease
						Per cent.	Per cent.
1.	1817	2,859	22,393	4,770	30,022	—	—
2.	1826	2,999	23,190	4,520	30,709	2'28	—
3.	1835	3,263	25,267	5,447	33,977	10'64	—
4.	1847	3,350	27,666	5,912	36,928	8'68	—
5.	1856	3,413	28,984	6,958	39,355	6'57	—
6.	1866	3,533	30,690	8,229	42,452	7'81 ¹	—
7.	1873	3,425	29,902	8,232	41,559	—	2'10 ²
8.	1878	3,465	31,500	8,929	43,894	{ 5'61 on 1873 3'39 on 1866	

¹ Increase to be explained by the annexation of Savoy and of the county of Nice.

² Decrease explained by the loss of Alsace-Lorraine in 1871.

With regard to the 3,000 vacant cures, of which M. Bougaud said so much, the following remarks are made by the Abbé Martin :

Starting from 1820, the progress was steady, if we make allowance for those disturbed times in which vocations are necessarily fewer ; year by year the gaps were filled up, and the ranks increased in number. M. Bougaud laments over the 3,000 vacant cures, and we certainly ought not to lose sight of the reverse side of the medal. Yet in our opinion, and in that of others we have consulted, the conclusion which he draws from this fact is absolutely false. It is enough to observe, first, the difference between this and the 15,000 vacant cures mentioned by Mgr. de Frayssinous in 1820 ; secondly, many of these cures have been created from year to year, so that there is an annual increase ; thirdly, that since the beginning of the century, and especially since 1835, all the ancient religious orders have been revived, and several instituted which are absolutely new ; fourthly, that some cures have been declared vacant which are in reality not required, so that their existence and their vacancy are equally unimportant.

This last remark requires explanation. In several dioceses, the two cases which follow often occur : firstly, a curate is assigned as a temporary arrangement to an aged priest with a laborious charge, but the office of curate, which was created for this special circumstance, is not suppressed on the appointment of a younger incumbent, who does not require help. The office is then set down as vacant, although the vacancy is apparent rather than real. Secondly, there are also a number of small rural parishes, adjacent to each other, which may easily be served by one priest, but which have each been set down as a separate incumbency.

Such cases occur in every diocese, and there are other, merely titular appointments, which have never been filled up since the Revolution. One instance, well known to us, may be given. M. l'Abbé Bougaud declares 26 incumbencies to be vacant in the diocese of Cahors, in which there are about 300,000 souls. Last June, however, 28 priests were ordained, and the Bishop told the writer of this paper that he should find it difficult to provide employment for them all. Out of the 459 parishes included in the diocese, the population in 99 is under 300 souls, and in 30 out of that number does not consist of 150 souls. There are sometimes two, three, and even four churches included within the limits of the civil division, which is termed the commune.

To show that we do not speak at random, we may cite facts collected last summer during the enforced leisure of illness.

Commune.	Parishes.	Population.	Priests.
Luzech	{ Luzech	1,148	2
	{ Camy	330	1
	{ Fages	140	1
	{ Caix	300	1
		<hr/> 1,918	<hr/> 5

It takes an hour and a quarter to go from Fages to Caix, passing through Camy and Luzech. Here we have five priests for 1,918 souls, and a commune consisting of four parishes, nor is this the only example which might be mentioned in the same diocese.

The conclusions of M. l'Abbé Bougaud, which have been so much misconstrued in England, are therefore not borne out by facts. The conclusions would only be legitimate if the diminution in the supply of priests were regular and progressive, and this is not the case. Cambrai is one of the dioceses painted yellow on M. Bougaud's map, that is, among those in which there is a deficiency of priests. The Cardinal Archbishop of Cambrai, however, quite recently spoke in public as follows :

Vocations to the priestly office are more numerous than ever in our diocese. There is an excellent spirit in all our seminaries : piety prevails in them, and study is vigorous and well directed. As for our numerous institutions for secondary education, their prosperity is always increasing, in spite of the powerful pressure brought to bear against them. The successes achieved in the Government examinations show that they have nothing to fear from a comparison with rival and highly favoured institutions.³

These figures and statements speak for themselves, and we are very glad to find that the case is as it is. We may now turn to another point, on which the Abbé Martin is equally satisfactory. Some of our readers are aware that Mr. Orby Shipley is engaged on a series of letters to the *Tablet* newspaper, the object of which is to show the habitual inaccuracy of the Protestant controversialist, Dr. Littledale. For our own part, we read whatever comes from Mr. Orby Shipley with pleasure, inasmuch as he has always written like a gentleman and like a scholar. It is a further question whether it is worth his while to demolish Dr. Littledale in the pages of the *Tablet*. We have never had any occasion to test the assertions of Dr. Littledale without finding him egregiously wrong and unfair, and we question whether any amount of proof of his own inaccuracy will ever suffice to wring from him an acknowledgment of his faults in this respect. He is a man, as far as we can gather, of undoubted ability, but also of singular intrepidity in assertion, combined with an equal amount of cowardice in retractation. His writings belong to the brag-and-swagger school of controversy, and we can only excuse his many misrepresentations on the score of ignorance of which he ought to be ashamed. The Abbé Martin in his late article comes across Dr. Littledale on two points. First, as to the Concordat of 1801, the Abbé Martin gives a very lucid statement of the history

³ *L'Univers*, September 15, 1879. See Table on p. 120.

and purport of this great act of the Holy See, and then subjoins—

Notwithstanding all these facts, of which we have only given a rapid summary, and which are given in detail by several historians—because Pope Pius the Seventh, while he was able to rescue the Church of France from absolute ruin, did not obtain all which he desired; because he was able to combine great firmness with great moderation, the Concordat and the organic articles have sometimes been confounded together; the laborious negotiations of 1801 have been treated as a joint intrigue, and have been described in such terms as the following: “The existing state of affairs is due to the conspiracy of Pius the Seventh with Napoleon the First, against the liberties of the Gallican Church, and therefore has the highest possible Roman Catholic sanction.”⁴ This was asserted in England, widely circulated in that country, and possibly obtains credence elsewhere.

Another misstatement of Dr. Littledale is noticed in the following passage—

Since the Concordat of 1801 France has had no benefices, strictly so called. The Concordat, or rather the organic articles, only recognize the cantonal deans as irremovable. Other priests may be removed at the pleasure of the bishop, or rather of his diocesan council. But practically changes are only made at the desire of the incumbents themselves. There are cases, however, where the good of the flock makes it imperative that there should be a change of priests, and such a change is therefore made, but with as much consideration and gentleness as possible. What we say of France applies also to Belgium, for the cases are similar, if not identical.

From this it is evident how far we are from the arbitrary acts described by Dr. Littledale, who asserts “that the same policy is being carried out more and more in the Anglo-Roman body, where the State does not meddle at all; that the Bishops in Belgium habitually extort bonds of resignation from the beneficed clergy.”⁵

To this we must make the general reply that there were originally no benefices, and yet that this did not hinder the progress of the Church. There are, moreover, many points of resemblance between the situation of the Church in the early ages of Christianity and her present situation in certain phases of modern society. It is still necessary that the Church should act in whatever way she can, when she is unable to act as she might desire. Does Dr. Littledale suppose that the priests of

⁴ *Why Ritualists do not become Roman Catholics.* R. F. Littledale. A reply to the Abbé Martin. The writer was prevented by a long and painful illness from carrying on the controversy, and can now only observe that if he were to notice in detail all the errors contained in Dr. Littledale's pamphlet, he would fill a thick volume.

⁵ R. F. Littledale. *Why Ritualists do not become Roman Catholics.*

the primitive Church treated their bishops as the Anglican bishops are treated now by too many of his colleagues, whether evangelical or ritualist? Does he really think the English Catholics to blame, because, in the course of the fifty years in which a little liberty has been accorded to them, they have not yet been able to reconstitute a perfect Church, with its institutions and organization complete? In common justice, when the Church has been despoiled, robbed, destroyed, when she is fettered by a crowd of restrictive laws, she should not be accused of having failed to do all which seems desirable. After being robbed, she is reproached with poverty; she is forbidden to open schools of higher instruction, and the clergy are accused of want of learning; she is not allowed to educate our young men, especially those of the higher classes, and then she is taunted with the insult that her clergy are a clergy of peasants. We must repeat that these accusations are neither reasonable, fair, nor honest.

After reading the remarks which refer to the Belgian bishops and clergy, we wrote at once to a friend in Belgium, who is incumbent of a large rural parish. Two successive letters did not enable this friend to understand what was meant by the vehement assertion that the bishops "habitually extort bonds of resignation." If Dr. Littledale means, and his language will bear this interpretation, that the Belgian bishops, before installing a priest, exact from him a blank form of resignation, we meet such an assertion by the most categorical and authoritative denial. Or does Dr. Littledale mean that the bishops oblige irremovable priests to resign at their own arbitrary desire, without deliberation or serious reasons? His words must at least bear this sense, and to this assertion also we oppose the most categorical and authoritative denial, after obtaining information from the episcopal records in Belgium.

We stated the case as follows: "Is it a fact that Belgian bishops habitually extort resignations from their clergy, first, by causing them to sign blank forms of resignation, which may be filled up at the pleasure of the episcopal chancellor, or, secondly, after their institution, by forcing them to resign against their desire, by means of threats, violence, and oppression? It will be understood that we do not enter into cases in which a priest has been accused, tried, and condemned in conformity with the ecclesiastical laws."

We received the following reply to these questions: "M. le Professeur, the assertions of which you speak in your letter of October 4th, are so absurd and unworthy that they do not seem to require official disproof. The bishops in Belgium conform in such matters, as in all others, to the canonical law, and to the decisions of the Holy See." This letter has received the signature of the first ecclesiastical dignitary in Belgium. I have received a letter from another episcopal office, in which it is declared to be "really extraordinary that any serious writer should permit himself to utter such strange misstatements."

While we are on the subject of Dr. Littledale's pamphlet, which

would require a volume to refute, we may say in passing that we deny the truth of his assertions respecting the origin of the Papal power (pp. 10, 11, 23), of infallibility (p. 11, note, p. 38), of Catholic theology (341), of evangelical demonstrations (p. 48), and we should have much to say on the whole work, both as regards its matter and its form. We must, however, return to the clergy of Belgium and France.

In fact, it would be far more easy to make a catalogue of the few assertions of Dr. Littledale which, by some strange mistake, happen to be accurate, than to chronicle and refute one by one his many misstatements. Yet we see that the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge* has re-issued his article in a cheaper form, and we believe it to be true that the *English Church Union* more or less adopted it. They are wise in their choice of a "dissuasive from Popery." Nothing answers that purpose better than a collection of good round assertions, the plumpness of which is unimpaired by the slightest regard to historical accuracy or to controversial scrupulosity.

2.—STATE OF AFFAIRS IN BELGIUM.

[WE have much pleasure in laying before our readers the following account of the "political situation" in Belgium which has grown out of the Elementary Education Act. It is from the pen of a well-informed correspondent in that country.]

Next September Belgium will keep the fiftieth anniversary of its national independence. The present situation of affairs in that country is not likely to make the occasion one of rejoicing for the whole nation. The Elementary Education Act voted last summer by a majority of seven in the Lower House, and by only two in the Senate, was a declaration of war by the present Liberal Ministry against the religion of by far the greater part of the people of Belgium. Hence the Catholics will probably abstain from any of the official festivities, unless a change of Government supervenes. The frauds and injustice with which, in electioneering matters, the Catholics have to contend, make their return to power improbable, even though they are, as could easily be shown, the bulk of the nation. None the less, the position of the Liberal Ministry is precarious.

As soon as the new law was promulgated, the resistance of the people to it began. Before three months had elapsed, nearly every one of the many communes of Belgium was endowed with a free Catholic school, opened or nearing completion. In this wise, rich and poor vied with each other in rejecting a law their bishops had energetically condemned. In more than one parish, where the Catholic schools were not ready to receive the children at the beginning of the scholastic year, the rich lent the drawing-rooms of their country houses to be used as school-rooms. A poor servant, to my knowledge, gave the savings of many years of service towards the new schools. Teachers gave up lucrative posts, and the certainty of a pension, in State schools, and went over to the Catholic schools by scores. Lastly, poor parents, often at the risk of losing their daily bread, sent their children literally by thousands to the Catholic schools, while the State schools were thinly populated, and in some cases wholly deserted. It is doubtful if ever an iniquitous law was more generally resisted and thoroughly detested by a whole people, than has been the new Educational

Law of M. Van Humbeck, who intended, as he boasted, by its means to pitch "the corpse of Catholicity into its grave."

The Liberal Premier, M. Frère-Orban, is an able Minister, full of ready resources. In opposition, he had denounced the Belgian Embassy to the Pope as a relic of a superstitious past. In office, he resolved to use it as a mine to shatter to atoms the Catholic resistance to the new law. Rome and Brussels exchanged views. The results supposed to have been obtained M. Frère embodied in a speech. He excused himself to his friends for maintaining a representative at the Vatican, by asserting, and attempting to prove by garbled extracts of correspondence with the Holy See, that Leo the Thirteenth disapproved of the conduct of the Belgian Bishops, and that the Catholics in Parliament and in the Press were at variance and in discord with their pastors and with Rome. The Catholic leader, M. Malou, easily refuted M. Frère, and showed that never were the people of Belgium so united to their bishops as now. He drew, too, a magnificent picture of the state of elementary Catholic education, and quoted figures to prove that the numbers of children frequenting free schools varied, in various localities, from ninety to forty-five per cent. He challenged a Parliamentary inquiry—which will shortly take place—into the exactitude of his assertions, and taunted the Government with not having told the House what the Holy See had said of it and of its works.

Fifteen days after this debate, the Yellow Book, containing the correspondence of M. Frère and the Belgian Envoy to the Pope, was published. It had been, we believe, communicated to the representatives of foreign powers at Brussels before the debate and before it was in the hands of the nation's representatives! Its contents did justice to the Belgian Bishops and to the wisdom of the Holy See. The constitutional question, said the Cardinal Secretary of State, had, in the Bishops' first Pastoral on the new law, been treated "in the wisest and clearest way." "The attitude of the clergy," he said, about the educational question, "was neither illegal nor subversive." As for the conduct to be pursued by the clergy after the law was voted, he said, "it was a very serious question, of which the solution belonged to the Bishops." In a despatch from the Belgian Envoy to his chief, the former writes that as to the question of primary education, Cardinal Nina never attempted to conceal "the displeasure which the new legislation

caused His Holiness." In another despatch, the Cardinal is reported to have said that the Pastoral of the Belgian Bishops, after the law had been voted, was in its doctrine unimpeachable, that one or two expressions might be thought too strong, but were excusable by the sorrow the Bishops felt at the passing of the new law. In a letter to the Nuncio at Brussels, the Cardinal says that M. Frère had judged the third Pastoral of the Bishops too severely, seeing that "it was in conformity with the principles and maxims of the Catholic Church applied, in these times, by the Holy See also to other countries." After this, the Declaration published on December 1st, by the Cardinal-Archbishop of Mechlin, was hardly needed, especially as the Catholics of Belgium never for an instant doubted that their Bishops and the Holy See were thoroughly in accord. Still, for the benefit of the Government and its dupes, it was wanted. It was well that the highest ecclesiastical representative in Belgium should declare in his own name and that of his colleagues that they were not at variance with the Holy See, and that he should prove this by documentary evidence, "not to Belgian Catholics," as his Eminence says, "who do not need this proof, but to those of my fellow-citizens, happily few in numbers, who repel not only the teachings of their Bishops, but even the teaching of the Holy See." We need not repeat here the proofs set forth by the Cardinal, as our weekly press has already given them. Rather let us glance an instant at the effect produced in the Liberal camp by the mine exploded by M. Frère. It has produced more than one rent in his own defences.

The Premier is now, perhaps, the best abused man in Belgium. His friends have nothing good to say of him. His policy towards the Holy See has been openly called in question in all the Liberal journals and at many Liberal meetings. Moderate Liberals ask why he could not, since the Pope had not spoken on the educational question in Belgium, leave well alone? More advanced Liberals say that if he dared not abolish the embassy to the Holy See, he might have left it to be supposed that it was merely an honorary thing, of no possible utility. The Radicals say that M. Frère has been well lectured by Rome, and that he has so bungled matters that he has proved the Holy See, the Belgian Bishops, and Belgian Catholics to be perfectly united. Moreover, all his partisans complain that he has afforded the Pope an opportunity of saying that Belgian

Catholics may and ought to be loyal to their national institutions, after which declaration, it will be impossible for Liberals to harp on their favourite theme—the disloyalty of Catholics to the Belgian Constitution.

Nevertheless, none of these murmurers will do anything at present to overthrow the Government. "But if we are willing to vote," says the *Flandre Libérale*, "with discipline, we are not willing to think with discipline, and it seems to us that many Liberals are of our opinion. Let us avoid a Ministerial crisis—good! But we will also think and say that the 'incalculable' results of the interchange of views (with Rome) are made only the more absurd by the 'tall talk' about them." The best hopes of a change in affairs in Belgium arise from the daily increase of taxation. It has been remarked that there is in Belgium a third party, neither hotly Catholic nor warmly Liberal, but very careful of its pockets. It is powerful enough to overthrow any Government. It contributes, by paying taxes, to the support of the State school, and, being respectably Catholic, it dares not refuse its alms to the Catholic schools. It would welcome, therefore, any project to relieve itself of this double burden. M. Malou's project for introducing the English primary educational system will certainly win over to his side this third party.

II.—REVIEWS.

1. *Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum Collectio Lacensis.* Auctoribus Presbyteris S.J. e domo B.V.M. sine labe conceptæ ad Lacum. Tomus quintus Acta et Decreta S. Conciliorum quæ ab Episcopis Germaniæ, Hungariæ, et Hollandiæ, ab a. 1789 usque ad a. 1869 celebrata sunt. Friburgi : Brisingiæ, 1879.

SECOND NOTICE.

AN interest attaches to these *Acta et Decreta* which very few documents can pretend to claim. They are not mere expressions of opinion about controverted points of doctrine, or resolutions intended to suit some emergency, but they are most weighty decisions, pronounced by competent authority, upon very many of the gravest matters which can well engage the attention of men in power. The ground over which the discussions travel is of unusually wide extent. Not only the cardinal truths of theology, dogmatic or moral, and of Catholic philosophy, but the principles of government and the great social questions of education and the rights of property receive careful consideration; and, while the explanations and arguments and enactments display much vigorous thought and various erudition, the very choice and succession of the subjects affords a useful and exceedingly trustworthy commentary upon the whole course of ecclesiastical affairs in the German-speaking regions of Europe, from the early part of the century to the year 1869. Those who are already well acquainted with the order of events will be able to confirm or correct their previous conclusions without any further guidance than such as is contained in the deliberations and declarations themselves; and where a little more help is needed, it is furnished in the best form in the historical notes and prefatory remarks introduced by the indefatigable and minutely careful editors. All the separate portions of the proceedings here chronicled manifestly cannot be of equal authority, if only for the simple reason that the arguments used in the course of a debate do not possess the same value as the conclusions at which the united wisdom of the disputants arrives when various opinions have been collated and compared. Yet even rejected opinions and refuted arguments may be worth recording, and the details of a discussion often vividly express the dangers of the time. If one speaker displays a less accurate acquaintance with the "litera-

ture of the subject," or another falls into the error of too rapid generalization, no other apology ought to be needed than that suggested by the editors in the introduction to the Acts of the meeting of Bishops at Würzburg. They remind us that little faults may be condoned where great excellence is found :

Ubi plura nitent . . . non ego paucis
Offendar maculis, quas aut incuria fudit,
Aut humana parum cavit natura.

They also tell us that this most important meeting was convened in haste, and that the bishops were called on to give their opinions in many cases without having had leisure to study the subject in all its bearings, or to prepare elaborate discourses. To those who know the circumstances under which the bishops met at Würzburg in 1848, and who also know how difficult it is in ordinary life to secure unanimity among men of separate experience and strong convictions, the only wonder will ever be that the leaders of Catholic thought in Germany, thus suddenly assembled at a time of unusual agitation, and without delay thrown unprepared into the responsible examination of numerous public questions as perplexing as they were vital, should have maintained through thirty-six sessions moderation of language and harmony of thought, inviolate and complete. Only where there is oneness of faith and singleness of aim is such a consummation feasible.

It must not be supposed that the May Laws came like a clap of thunder in a cloudless sky. The watchmen on the tower had seen the storm luring in the distance long before it broke over their heads, and had caught with quick ears the low wailing of the breeze which presaged the hurricane. In the early months of the year 1848, the spirit of the revolution, which had already crossed the frontier into Germany, made its evil presence felt in act, and it was soon apparent that the Church was under menace, and that the first efforts of her enemies would be to disturb in some manner her relations with the civil power, although at that date it was not easy to conjecture the precise character of the change to be proposed. It was necessary to be prepared for battle. To look on helplessly at such a time and let things take their course would have been criminal. We who know now as matter of history how grandly successful were the efforts of the vigilant pastors may linger awhile with grateful hearts over the record of their

fearless zeal, and mark with honest exultation the strength that comes from unity of faith and scorn of compromise.

The Bishops of Treves, Münster, and Paderborn repaired to Cologne in the middle of May, 1848, and there spent three days in consultation with their Metropolitan, Cardinal John von Geissel. They settled many practical doubts, but the most important decision at which they arrived was that a National Synod of Germany ought to be convoked as soon as the results of the political conferences which were then being held at Frankfort and Berlin should have been ascertained. Three months later the bishops present in Cologne on the occasion of the solemn dedication of the Cathedral, in conjunction with Cardinal von Geissel and the Papal Nuncio from Vienna, Mgr. Viale Prelà, Archbishop of Carthage, confirmed the former decision agreeing both that the calling of the National Synod was urgent, and that yet it would be better to wait till something could be known about the measures proposed to the Government in regard of the ecclesiastical status and of Catholic education. It was not long before it became painfully evident that the deliberations in Frankfort and Berlin could have no favourable issue for the Church. The provisions approved at Frankfort under the pretentious title of *Deutsche Grundrechte* not only failed to recognize the independence of the Church and her right of internal legislation, but denied that education appertained to her in any way, and no doubt could be entertained that the Berlin Conference would adopt the same tone. Without further delay, the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne proceeded to Frankfort to confer with the leading Catholics there, clergy and laity, among whom Dr. Döllinger, then Provost of the Chapter of Munich, was one. There was only one opinion, that the sooner the Bishops of Germany could be brought together in a National Council, the better would it be for the cause of religion. The Archbishop, on the same occasion, received letters from many bishops, urging him to lose no time, and saying that while a general interchange of opinions was absolutely necessary, it was also highly desirable that it should be by word of mouth rather than by message. The Bishop of Breslau offered his services to secure the participation of the Austrian hierarchy, and the Bishop of Spire made the same promise in behalf of Bavaria. The former, moreover, announced that the Cardinal, Prince Archbishop of Salzburg, had already signified his approval of the movement and his

desire to take part in it. By this time the crisis was so imminent that it seemed unsafe to defer the execution of the project even long enough to procure the formal sanction of the Holy See, for a little additional delay might make the contemplated Convocation no longer possible. To name place and time, and issue the invitations, and to make known to the Holy Father with all convenient speed the step which had been taken, seemed the only course still open. To avoid all infringement of the letter of the law, the Archbishop of Cologne invited his brethren, the Bishops of Germany, not to a National Synod strictly so called, but to a "free consultation," by letters issued on the 1st of October, 1848, to the Cardinal, Prince Archbishop of Salzburg, and to the Archbishops of Munich, Bamberg, Friburg, and Posen, who were asked to communicate the invitation severally to their suffragans. The place was to be Würzburg (Herbipolis), and the opening day the 21st of October. The closely reasoned and statesmanlike *Pro memoria* which accompanied the invitation is a most valuable historical document, and remains an enduring testimony of the almost prophetic insight of the noble-hearted and eloquent Cardinal von Geissel. He begins by declaring that the meeting to which he invites all his brother-bishops is not only desirable, but that it is simply necessary for the settlement both of the external and of the internal relations of the Church in Germany. That part which sets forth the difficult position of the Church in relation to the civil Government is more full of meaning now than when it came from the pen of the Metropolitan. We must be satisfied with a short extract. The prelate premises that three possible "eventualities" are before the Church in Germany: (1) the triumph of the old Bureaucratic Government, which he considers scarcely more than just possible; (2) the triumph of democracy, in which case "the Church confronts a deadly enemy which, in its fanatical assertion of liberty, means liberty for itself, and in case of necessity, if it cannot prevent it, for others also, but never, no never, under any condition, for the Catholic Church, and which will not rest until the last safeguard of the one surviving authority, the Catholic Church, has been broken down;" (3) the entire separation of Church and State, which, as the most favourable solution, is the object of the hopes of very many. In any case it is highly necessary for the Bishops of Germany to form their plan of action. Even in the third and most desirable condition, there can be no standing still with folded arms.

The Church will have to see to herself, to hold her own, and fight her way unaided. The plan of campaign demands forethought and activity. Already in the Parliament of Frankfort they have been casting lots over the Church. The voting on the ecclesiastical status has turned out adverse, and there is reason to fear that the education question will have a still more unhappy issue. In Berlin there are no better hopes on either point, and in Austria, Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, Hanover, and the rest, the Church is bound hand and foot. Therefore the Church must keep before her eyes her new position in the State as it is and will be, in order to know what relations are to be maintained with it at present and for the future. For the bishops it is a cogent duty to investigate the far-reaching encroachments and despotic acts of the Bureaucrats in reference to the spirit of the present and the requirements of the future, and to make fitting provisions. The usurpations hitherto committed in many lands, those more especially which regard the exercise of State-patronage in ecclesiastical appointments, the unrestricted intercourse of bishops and other clerics with Rome, the promulgation of Papal decrees and episcopal indults and pastorals, disciplinary regulations for clergy and laity, the appeal *tantum ab abusu*, the right to teach in schools and colleges, the power to summon and pronounce upon the competency of the professors of theology in lyceums, academies, universities, the training of Church students in its different stages, the final examinations with a view to Holy Orders and the cure of souls, the administration of ecclesiastical revenues, mixed marriages, and the like—have to a greater or a less extent been continued to the present time, and require that there should be a full discussion and deep consideration of the proper mode of dealing with the State now and hereafter in respect of all these several points (p. 949).

Thus more than thirty years ago the alarm was sounded and the calamities of these most recent days were foreseen. The worst fears have been realized at last. Bishops and priests have been proscribed, and Catholic churches have been given over to sacrilegious intruders; but what no earthly power could prevent, the courageous protest of the German Bishops for many years deferred.

Nor when the first great wave of revolution had swept by with more noise than destructive power, did the bishops rest from their labours. There were deeper causes at work, they well knew, than mere social discontent, however clamorous. False principles were poisoning the mind and vitiating the conscience of the people. Indifferentism in religion and practical atheism, the natural outgrowth of a system in which opinions take the place of articles of faith, were spreading with fatal rapidity, and preparing the way for those pessimistic views

of life which are, of all the miseries now so heavily pressing upon the youth of Germany, the last and worst. In hearts where hope lies dead there is no chance for justice, or mercy, or truth.

What, then, could be done by those to whom the care of souls had been intrusted to check the growing evil of indifference? That portion of the population which had already passed from Protestantism to "modern Paganism" was beyond the reach of any spiritual aid except that which comes from the prayers of the faithful. Episcopal zeal could not make itself directly felt as a saving power outside the limits of the Church. But to preserve Catholics from the foul contagion was yet possible. To this task, therefore, the Bishops of Germany applied themselves during that "new lease of toleration" which their united counsels and intrepid defence of the rights of the Church against the *Deutsche Grundrechte* had secured when all seemed lost.

Englishmen of late years have been made familiar with certain processes of "revivalism." Men like Messrs. Moody and Sankey having their commission from themselves, self-sent preachers, undertake a tour of conversion, and really do stir thousands of hearts to their inmost depths by their voluble discourses and popular hymn-singing. They say much which is true and Scriptural, and much which, though not true, is set forth in pious and edifying words, and poor souls haunted by the sense of sin eagerly listen to the glowing words, which promise peace of conscience on easy terms. The preachers go their way and are forgotten. Some of the true things which they have said may live in a few minds, but the influence of their words upon the multitude is in a few weeks imperceptible, because so-called conversions, which are effected by unauthorized apostles, and in which the sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ to raise the dead to life have no part, are, except in rare cases, unreal and unprofitable.

A Catholic mission is as different from a Methodist revival as true repentance is from spasmodic "assurance of salvation." In our last number we alluded to the extraordinary development of the practice of holding missions which is one of the noticeable features of the ecclesiastical history of Germany during the twenty years which preceded the outbreak of the Bismarck persecution. These missions did not constitute the whole or even the largest part of the good influences which were busy among Catholic families in those days of preparation for the

coming struggle ; but in the pages of the fifth volume of the Acts and Decrees we certainly find abundant evidence of the earnestness of pastoral solicitude with which the bishops everywhere in Germany encouraged and assisted the movement as in the highest degree salutary to their flock and grateful to themselves. The Redemptorist Fathers and the Fathers of the Society of Jesus shared the campaign, the former being first in the field, the latter, by the coincidence of the then recent expulsion from Switzerland (in 1847), being able to give more undivided attention to that particular form of good work, because many of their number were actually at that time in want of employment. After an unsuccessful attempt to obtain a permanent residence in Baden, the Society of Jesus gained an entrance into Prussia in 1851, and in the course of five years had established houses at Cologne, Münster, Paderborn, Aix-la-Chapelle, Mayence, Bonn, and Gorheim near Sigmaringen. Other houses were opened afterwards. At once the missions were organized, and the system, attaining its full proportions from the very outset, was continued with no serious interruption until 1870. Fifteen Fathers were "told off" for the duty. They were divided into four companies, and were ready to respond to the invitations, which poured in thick and fast, not only from all parts of Prussia, but from all Germany. Each mission lasted a fortnight, and the attendance was usually very large, as the Catholics from miles round used every exertion to be present. "The State" looked on with approval, wisely at that time recognizing in the revival of faith and charity a powerful antidote to sedition and socialism.

At the Meeting of Würzburg (1848), which, if we except the minor conferences of the same year at Cologne and Salzburg and the National Synod of Hungary in 1822, stands first in chronological order, the bishops were unanimous in desiring that missions should be given, but they were deeply sensible of the difficulties which must first be surmounted.

Concerning missions to the people also was held a long and careful deliberation, and at the first some advised that an association of secular priests should be formed for the purpose of giving these missions. The Church, they thought, in the presence of the great and unprecedented evils of this age, was bound to have recourse to remedies not employed before, being chiefly solicitous to rouse faith and virtue, without which all other aids were unavailing. To the attainment of this object they considered that missions were especially adapted ; and

that this could be safely inferred from the fruits which had been produced by them in France, the Tyrol, and the Saltzburg district. Finally, they feared that a time might soon arrive when in certain provinces, on account of the scarcity of priests, the only hope of keeping up religion would be in the missions.

Nor, on the other hand, did it escape observation, that amid the evils of the time, with the wide dissemination of dangerous ideas, there would certainly be a very great difficulty in establishing a college of missionaries, both from want of necessary funds and on account of the feelings of dislike with which many persons, ecclesiastics among the number, regarded the religious orders and their mission-giving. In the end it was resolved by the assembled prelates to give expression to their sentiments upon this subject as follows, and to communicate the same by letter to their clergy :

"The meeting of bishops declares that missions to the people are not only generally (*alias*) useful, but at the present time singularly desirable for the restoration of the decaying vigour of Christian life" (p. 981).

All difficulties were speedily overcome, and ten years later we find numerous attestations of the happy effects of the great mission campaign. One extract shall suffice, selected from the Council which stands first in the volume. In the Provincial Council of Gran, held in the year 1858, we read :

We rejoice in the Lord that missions to the people, which have been in common practice elsewhere with immense profit to souls, have recently been introduced into this apostolic kingdom. These more unusual exercises of religion, of their own nature forcibly arresting the attention of men, strengthen religious conviction, excite remorse of conscience, and so prepare the way to change of life. Experience has shown abundantly that missions to the people dissipate prejudice conceived against the Catholic Church, revive respect for the priesthood, renew the Catholic spirit, bring pious sodalities into favour, rouse from their sleep of death men long lost in habits of sin, making them seize the plank left after shipwreck, remove scandals, repair by proper restitution and compensation injuries inflicted, reconcile enemies, restore piety and domestic peace, and oftentimes call back to truth the hearts of those who are wandering in error.

Therefore, as the bishops will endeavour to sustain and promote in their dioceses the practice of these missions, so those who have the care of souls, the more surely and efficaciously to procure the salvation of the faithful intrusted to their keeping, will receive the missionaries with kind welcome, will entertain them in charity, and will do all that zeal suggests to make their labours more successful (pp. 75, 76).

All the Provincial Councils, and nearly all the meetings of bishops, repeat with no substantial alteration these praises of the missions and prayers for their continued success.

2. *The Training of the Apostles.* Part I. (Quarterly Series). By the Rev. H. J. Coleridge. London: Burns and Oates.

Instead of any criticism on this new volume, we must content ourselves with inserting the greater part of the Preface, in which the main idea of this part of the *Public Life of our Lord* is explained. Father Coleridge says: "The space of time in the Public Life of our Blessed Lord which is considered in the present volume, was probably not very long in its actual duration, though we cannot fix its beginning or ending with perfect certainty. But it was a period which was hardly surpassed by any other in the importance of the issues which were decided in its course, though its prominent incidents were few, and it is quite possible to pass it over without much remark in framing a general narrative of our Lord's life. It extends from the delivery of the Sermon on the Mount to the point of time at which, after the first conspiracy against His life made by the Pharisees and Herodians, our Lord began to retire before the opposition which His teaching as to the Sabbath, and the miracles which He had wrought on that day, evoked in those who were ever after to be His bitter enemies and persecutors, the Chief Priests and ecclesiastical authorities of the holy nation.

"The first part of this period of a few weeks or months, as the case may have been, was employed by our Lord in His usual course of missionary preaching in Galilee, and we have therefore but few records of distinct incidents. But it was also remarkable for some very striking and significant miracles, which stand out from the general history with a prominence of their own, on account of the Divine truths which our Lord seems to have wished to connect with them. These are the miracles of the first marvellous fishing in the Lake of Galilee, of the healing of the leper, and of the healing of the paralytic who was let down in his bed through the tiles of the house where our Lord was preaching, in the presence of a large assembly of Scribes and Pharisees gathered from different parts of the Holy Land as well as from the towns of Galilee. The second part of the time of which we are speaking, embraces our Lord's visit to Jerusalem for the feast of the Pasch, the second in the three years of His preaching—a visit which was signalized by the first open breach between Him and the authorities of the Synagogue. It was at this time that our Lord healed the man at the Pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath Day—perhaps the

Sabbath of the feast itself—and further, ordered the man whom He had healed to take up his bed and go to his house, as if with the express design of arousing public attention, and bringing on the disputation which followed. This occasion first brought our Lord into direct collision with the Chief Priests, and it is from this that we must date the long difference which ensued, and which was terminated only by His death. It seems to have been soon after this that the incidents occurred of the disciples plucking the ears of corn in the fields, and the second public miracle on the Sabbath Day, when our Lord, after the question had been formally raised by His adversaries, healed the man who had a withered hand. After this we find Him retiring from the more public and open manner of preaching which He had hitherto followed in Galilee, and doing this in so remarkable a way as to draw to it the attention of His disciples, who saw in it, as we may judge from the words of St. Matthew, a special fulfilment of the prophecies concerning the Messias.

“Even if it could ever have been otherwise, the treatment which He experienced on the part of the Chief Priests and rulers at Jerusalem must have concentrated our Lord’s hopes and cares very mainly on the small body of disciples whom he had gathered around Him. They were not yet formed into the band of Apostles, distinctively so called, but most of them were already, perhaps, His inseparable companions. It is natural to consider the incidents and the teaching of this time as having been specially addressed to them in our Lord’s intention, and to look upon their special training for their lofty office as having been already begun. It was mainly for them that the first great miracle of this period, the miracle of the fishing, was worked. They were more likely than any others to profit fully by the teaching implied or directly conveyed in the other miracles and actions of this time, such as the healing of the leper and of the paralytic. It was in reference to them that much of the incidental teaching of the same period was delivered, such as the doctrine conveyed in our Lord’s defence of His indulgence to them in the matter of public fasts and penances, and in the eating the ears of corn in the fields on the Sabbath Day. To them, more than to any others, did He look for the fruitful intelligence of the great dogmatic truths which He also set forth at this time. Hence this volume has been called by a name in reference to this view of the subject-matter of which

it treats, and the name will apply to those which succeed it, until the narrative reaches the point of the great confession of St. Peter.

"The great doctrinal document of this period of the Gospel narrative is the long discourse which is contained in the fifth chapter of St. John's Gospel. Apart from the treasures of dogmatic teaching which are to be found, as theologians know, in that famous discourse, it seems to have an historical importance which has not always been duly recognized by the Christian historians of our Lord's life. It seems to put on record, briefly but completely, the principal features of the position in which the Jewish rulers were placed by the providential action of God, in setting before them the various kinds of testimony to our Lord's Divine mission to which He there appeals, as well as the effect upon His own counsels and movements of the attitude of defiant resistance assumed by those rulers. In a certain sense the whole of the Gospel history, as far as it took the tone and line which it did actually take, in consequence of the action of the priests at Jerusalem towards our Lord, is summed up in this single chapter, the whole of the preceding events leading up to it, and the whole of those that follow taking their colour from it. It has been natural and even necessary, in a work like the present, to dwell on this chapter at considerable length. It has all the characteristic difficulties which belong to the discourses of our Lord as reported by St. John, and in no part of his work will a writer who undertakes the task before me feel less satisfied with his own performance. But it would be a sign of certain failure if such a writer thought he had succeeded in fathoming all the depths of these Divine words. I shall be content if the labour which I have bestowed upon them should induce other commentators to work in the same direction, and I am confident that there will be found few passages in the Gospels which throw more light upon the history, which point more clearly to the elements of a full comprehension of the dealings of the Jewish authorities with our Lord, and of His dealings with them.

"It is indeed sad to have so vividly brought before us the truth that, in this respect also, our Lord fulfilled beforehand the prophecy which He made as to what should befall His disciples, that "a man's foes should be those of his own household,"—to see so plainly how the rulers of the holy nation were the main instruments, first in the apparent defeat of our Lord's attempts

for its salvation, and then in His murder and in the final reprobation and repudiation of that nation for its guilt in its treatment of Him. It is clear that the people were ready enough to receive our Lord. They had flocked to the Baptism of St. John, and that had prepared them for Him Who was to come after St. John. They understood the Divine meaning of the miracles as evidences, and the character and personal demeanour of our Lord won their hearts, as they could hardly fail to win them. But their natural leaders, the members of the Mosaic hierarchy, set themselves against Him, and used the whole power of their position most unscrupulously, first to discredit Him, and ultimately to take away His life. Nowhere in all history is there a more signal instance of the influence of a dominant class in determining the action and the fate of a nation. But in this instance it was the priesthood which God had established which was responsible for a national sin no less heinous than the judicial murder, by the forms and powers which He had Himself set up, of the Redeemer of mankind, the Incarnate Son of God. This issue is as yet in the future in the narrative of this volume, but it is already determined upon, and our Lord, in the discourse of which mention has been made, has pointed out the evil principles from which it was to proceed.

"Such is the certain truth of the history, and it is far better to examine carefully the spiritual and moral evils, on which our Lord sets His mark in this discourse, in their working out the issue, than to shrink from the full lesson which such truths bring home to ourselves. The history of the treatment of our Lord by these men is the history, in principle, not only of the evil effects of ambition, self-seeking, and the other vices by which they were infected, as repeated over and over again in the annals of the Church, but it also furnishes us, when considered in the light of His own comments on their conduct, with the key to the resistance to the Christian and Catholic evidences, in all times and by all sorts of men. In a very few words, fewer, perhaps, even than those in which our Lord Himself set forth these truths, St. John has recorded for us this most important revelation of the human heart made by Him Who knew what was in man."

3. *Sunshine and Storm in the East*, or Cruises to Cyprus and Constantinople.
By Mrs. Brassey. Longmans, Green, and Co., 1880.

Another narrative of yachting experiences told in the cheery gossiping style of the authoress of *A Voyage in the Sunbeam*, is necessarily welcome. Whether she takes her readers with her round the world, as in her earlier volume, or twice to the end of the Mediterranean and back as in the later one, they are always in pleasant company, and can almost cheat themselves into the fancy that they form part of that delightful little family group which visits distant shores without wandering away from home, because it takes home along with it—children and nursery-maids, and the rest. Four years intervened between the two Mediterranean trips which share in nearly equal portions the book before us. Mrs. Brassey speaks of the desolation wrought by the dreadful war in that short interval; and to this the title of the book has reference. "Melancholy indeed," she says, "seemed the change in the Turkish capital during the four years since our last visit—a change from all that was bright and glittering to all that was dull and miserable and wretched."

The coasting of Cyprus, which occupied about a week, including three days during which the *Sunbeam* lay at Larnaka while the travellers mounted to Nikosia by Sir Garnet Wolseley's invitation, was accomplished in the middle of November, 1878, at which time Cyprus was in ill-repute after the sickness of the summer months. The Indian troops had been withdrawn, leaving behind them a good name, "as the best-behaved and most docile soldiers ever seen." The sick-list even in November was disproportionately large, but the rapid variations of temperature would afford some reason for this. Mrs. Brassey tells us that during her stay it was very cold in the night and remained quite cool till 9 a.m., when all at once it became intensely hot. She was assured that in the summer the heat had been beyond all the experience of old Indian officers, although even then the change from the day to the night was very considerable, the thermometer falling from 120° to 80°.

The poor fellows had to sleep eight together in a bell tent, on the ground, without any comforts, with but few duties to perform, and no amusements to distract their attention from thinking who might next be seized by the fever. The Indians suffered just as much as the British. The difficulties of interment were great among men of so many different religions. Caste had to be considered. Some burned their dead; the

rest buried them, with various peculiar ceremonies. Even among the Europeans there were Greek, Mohammedan, Catholic, and Protestant ideas on the subject to be taken into consideration.

The little yacht-party itself, in those few days at Larnaka, had painful experience in this kind. One of the ship's crew, who had been seized with dysentery after leaving Messina, seemed to be rapidly improving till they reached Cyprus. At Larnaka he was so much worse that it was necessary to remove him into hospital, where he died three weeks later. Yet, even then, there were men who refused to judge by first appearances, and who stoutly maintained that, "if the same number of troops had been landed at Malta, under precisely similar conditions, they would have suffered just as much."¹

Mrs. Brassey notes some curious points in the national character of the Cypriotes. One of the wealthiest men in the island, who had a large estate, "including acres of the richest land in this most fertile valley," was delighted to seize an opportunity of earning 7s. 6d. a day as interpreter, and was quite ready to accept the situation of officer's servant. Also, a young lady, "daughter of one of the richest men in Nikosia, a member of the Council, and the holder of other important offices, who had worked an ornamental chemise-shaped overcoat, one of the specialities of native art, being informed that Sir Garnet Wolseley had sent it as a present to the Queen, and that her Majesty was much pleased with it and begged that two more might be made, was so far removed from any sentimental appreciation of the honour conferred upon her, that, as soon as she had finished the next specimen, "she sent her servant with the garment to the camp, giving her strict orders not to part with her parcel until she had received the money."

At Constantinople the effects of the war were visible everywhere. The Sultan was in alarm for his life, great personages were reducing their expenditure, the refugees had arrived in multitudes. An appointment with the Grand Vizier came to a strange ending. Our travellers were received with great ceremony at the palace, but they waited and waited in vain. Their host had been summoned by the poor Sultan to keep him company amid the terrors of a rumoured plot. The charity of the Turkish ladies was conspicuous. They had made great personal sacrifices to relieve the sufferers, but, instead of feeling that their virtuous efforts would gain for them increased esteem

¹ P. 278.

from all whose friendship was worth the having, they were mightily ashamed of their comparatively scanty display of jewelled cups and their less gorgeously bedizened halls of state, and tried to shun the observation of foreign visitors who had seen them in more prosperous days. It is an essentially Christian idea that men are no better for being rich, and no worse for being poor. There are sadder things than even the fall from opulence to beggary, and pride of wealth is one.

We heard a great deal about the poor refugees and their patient uncomplaining conduct during last winter. They came in by thousands, but took thankfully what was given them, helped the women and children first, and never squabbled among themselves, perishing with hunger as they were. It must have been heart-breaking work, for, give what you would and do what you could, it was all a mere drop in the ocean. Mrs. Hanson takes a great interest in the refugees, and has quite a number of families close to her at Kandili. She feeds and clothes them, and gives them stuff and silks to embroider, of which they make Turkish towels, which are sold at from 2s. to 12s. each. At Therapia, the other day, Sir Henry Layard had given some of the men work in road-mending, which they were to do in return for their food. Colonel Blunt was riding out one day, when one of their number came and spoke to him, and remarked that on a previous occasion, when on a journey through the country, he had entertained him at his house. Colonel Blunt perfectly remembered the circumstance, and the fact that he had been the owner of a beautiful house and garden and estate, and was the kaimakam, or head man, of the district—quite a grand personage. Here he was now mending roads, and grateful for a little rice and flour. Fancy an English deputy-lieutenant, or even a borough mayor, placed in the same situation! and the kaimakam has a much larger tract of country under his control than either of those functionaries (pp. 370, 371).

The first of the two voyages described by Mrs. Brassey in this pleasant volume extended from September, 1874, to January, 1875, and the second from September, 1878, to the end of the same year. Many woodcuts, prepared principally from photographs taken on the spot by Mrs. Brassey herself, and from sketches of the Hon. A. Y. Bingham, who was one of the party, and some excellent maps, adorn the book. M. Gustave Doré is responsible for the design on the cover.

4. *Cyprus, as I saw it in 1879.* By Sir Samuel White Baker. London : Macmillan and Co., 1879.

Sir Samuel Baker disclaims all intention of writing a history of Cyprus, or a description of its interesting antiquities, under the conviction that the works of General di Cesnola, Captain Saville, and others, will satisfy the ordinary student. His object is to impart much practical knowledge, the result of personal observation and inquiry in the course of a most original tour of inspection to which he and Lady Baker devoted some months of the year just passed, remaining on the island in movement or in residence from January to the end of July. Travelling on mules with gipsy-vans in attendance has in Cyprus for the simple tourist many and most remarkable advantages and disadvantages not unequally distributed, but for the student who is his own historian afterwards the advantages largely predominate. A journey, which less cleverly described would seem wearisome, is full of varied interest as it is here presented, and the two vans, which are always the central object in the picture, contribute in no small degree to the liveliness of the narrative by their eccentric conduct in a country quite new to such experience. "I invariably found," says Sir Samuel Baker, "that during the day I hated my van and in the evening I blessed it. It certainly delayed us on the march. . . ."¹ And as memory paints in glowing colours the picture of delight which the van presented when dinner was nearly ready, the words escape from a heart full of gratitude, ". . . if the world were girded by a good road instead of a useless equator, I should like to be perpetually circum-vanning it."

Good roads are scarce in Cyprus, and in the towns there is a peculiarity of house-construction which caused the chief van to look "ten years older" when it had performed no greater exploit than that of passing down the main-street of Larnaca. From under the low roofs on each side of the street wooden water-spouts protrude to a distance of some six feet, at about the height required for dislodging the outside passengers of an English omnibus. The van being two feet taller than an omnibus suffered severely. In Dali (Idalium) the citizens kindly tore down or sawed off the water-spouts to give free passage. This was only one instance of the courtesy which the poor islanders everywhere displayed. The Cypriotes are

¹ P. 87.

very dirty and very benevolent, extremely simple, and so "painfully good" that no dangers break the monotony of travelling. "It would be just as absurd to attend church in London with revolvers in your belt as to appear with such a weapon in any part of Cyprus."

On several points Sir Samuel Baker contradicts reports which had been widely disseminated. Game is not plentiful, and heather does not exist in Cyprus. The apparent abundance of game is due to the fact that all the birds that are shot find their way at once to two or three towns. "Because the market of Larnaca was well supplied with woodcocks, red-legged partridges, and hares, at low prices," the newspaper correspondents "rushed to a conclusion that the island teemed with game, forgetful of the fact that every Cypriote has a gun, and that numbers were shooting for the consumption of the few." The assertion that the surface of the ground was covered with heather, is founded in a mistaken identity. A low thorny bush, at a distance resembling heather, grows in some quantity.

One of the objects of the excursion was to see and judge whether Cyprus deserves its bad name for unhealthiness, and the conclusion at which it would seem that our author ultimately arrived is that some parts of the island are exceedingly unhealthy from permanent causes, but that the panic which followed upon the British occupation was in great part due to most reprehensible carelessness in selecting places of encampment. Upon this point much sensible advice is offered by one who is certainly entitled to give an opinion.

It is impossible to be too careful in the selection of a camping-ground; the effect of fever germs may be the result of one night's bivouac in an unhealthy locality; and a new country is frequently stamped as pestilential from the utter carelessness of the traveller or officer in command of troops.

As a general rule the immediate neighbourhood of water should be avoided. A clear stream is a tempting object, and the difficulty of carrying water for the supply of troops is important; but it is less than the necessity of carrying the sick. If once the fever of malaria attacks an individual, he becomes unfitted for his work; the blood is poisoned, and he is the victim of renewed attacks, which baffle medical skill, and lead to other serious complications. Avoid the first attack. This may be effected by the careful selection of the camping-ground. Never halt in a bottom, but always on a height (p. 25).

On the arrival of our travellers at Larnaca a great part of the mystery was cleared up by the first walk in the suburbs,

and it is wonderful indeed that those to whose care the health of our soldiers was confided could not have used their eyes and their common sense to more purpose for the elementary survey required before they fixed the military station.

It was unnecessary to seek for the chief cause of unhealthiness ; this was at once apparent in the low swamps on the immediate outskirts of the town. In ancient days the shallow harbour of Cittyum existed on the east side of modern Larnaca ; whether from a silting of the port, or from the gradual alteration in the level of the Mediterranean, the old harbour no longer exists, but is converted into a miserable swamp, bordered by a raised beach of shingles upon the sea-board. . . . The site was pointed out where the troops were encamped in the tremendous heat of July in the close vicinity of the swampy ground, upon pestiferous soil, and the usual tales of commissariat blunders were recounted.

Water is at all times very close at hand, but not in a manageable form, and many signs are visible everywhere that even from ancient times the difficulty has been felt of keeping up a constant supply of this first necessary of life. The running water, instead of helping wholesome irrigation, is a plentiful source of mischief, for there are, properly speaking, no rivers in the island.² A gush of water from the hills pours down some deep-cut channel in a muddy torrent, and then nearly or altogether loses itself in marshes on the level ground. The total silting-up of the embouchure in process of time is an inevitable result when a fitful stream heavily charged with sediment is not held together in a narrow course. Each *freshet* adds to the difficulty by depositing another layer of soil to make the bed of the stream more shallow for the next inundation. The inhabitants of Cyprus are mainly dependent upon wells. Well-sinking is a comparatively easy process, and the native engineers, by an inherited instinct derived from the experience of many centuries, possess very remarkable skill in selecting the localities, boring the shafts, and combining many separate springs into systems of wells. It is to be hoped that artesian wells may be found practicable in the lower land. The subterranean water-power in some parts of the island is very great, and it might be possible to open out powerful streams, to compensate in some degree for the silting-up of the natural rain-courses. But, as Sir Samuel Baker wisely observes, "It is more important to encourage the natives to make the best of the system of connected wells, good in itself and as far as it goes, than to try to

² P. 348.

supersede it all at once by methods theoretically better, requiring expensive imported machinery and skilled workmen, and therefore not immediately useful. These improvements should be gradually introduced, and in the meantime much can be done at slight cost by the judicious extension of a system of water supply thoroughly understood by the Cypriote engineers, and readily accomplished with the means already at command. This mode of action, which would be good in any case, is under the circumstances almost the only course open to the friends of Cyprus; for in the grave uncertainty of the duration of the English protectorate capitalists will scarcely be willing to embark in gigantic schemes for the amelioration of the conditions of existence in that island, which many sovereign races have held in succession, and none for very long,—“Phœnicians, Greeks, Egyptians, Persians, Romans, Byzantine rulers, Saracens, Byzantine rulers again, English, Lusignans, Venetians, Turks, and once more English in 1878.”

The general conclusion to which the knowledge gained in the gipsy-van exploration would seem to lead, is that Cyprus, to one who lands at Larnaca, improves upon acquaintance, and that, if only the turn of events could open out a future having some assurance of stability, so that English energy might find a fair field for enterprize, that which is most objectionable now could be, if not improved off the face of the island, at least reduced within narrow limits, and rendered comparatively innocuous. Limasol, we are told, will certainly be the future capital.

5. *Religion and Science: Their union historically considered.* By Maurice Ronayne, S.J. New York : P. F. Collier, 1879.

An accusation, so persistently repeated and so little founded as that which charges the Church with the desire of suppressing scientific research, deserves a fresh answer from time to time. Taught by experience, we cannot suppose that any refutation will ever kill off a convenient calumny, but there are good grounds for hoping that each vindication of truth and justice will meet the eyes of some men who honestly desire to be enlightened, and that explanations which cannot convince those who are not open to conviction will be of use to others whose ignorance has not been very culpable. The author in his Preface quotes some remarks of men well known to the present

generation, which show that the accusation lives and thrives. Professor Huxley says that the Catholic Church "must as a matter of life and death resist the progress of science and modern civilization." Professor Tyndal observes politely that "in relation to science, the Ultramontane brain, through lack of exercise, is virtually the undeveloped brain of the child."

Since the assumption is that the Church has been consistently from the first opposed to the acquisition of natural knowledge, the historical proof of the utter falseness of this assumption begins from early days, but the larger portion of the book deals with the action of the Church in comparatively modern times. The case of the pet martyr of science, Galileo, is well and clearly put. He himself, even before he had made good his opinion upon a merely scientific basis, insisted that the Scriptural account was at variance with his theory and must give way to it. Evidently no one who believed in the absolute truthfulness of Scripture could admit such a pretension. Upon the hypothesis of a direct contradiction between an astronomical discovery and the *true sense* of a passage in Holy Writ every good Catholic would say now in 1880 what the Roman Congregation (not the Pope) said in 1616. It is more possible for an astronomer to make a mistake than for the Holy Ghost to teach a falsehood. But the blunder was in supposing that there need be any contradiction, and that blunder was common to Galileo and his judges. The learned Abbé Moigno has a few words very much to the point: "It was Galileo—and this is the secret of his condemnation—who was the first to see an absolute contradiction between the *Sto Sol!* of Josue and the rotation of the earth. Still, Francis Arago, one of the most illustrious astronomers of the nineteenth century, does not fear to affirm that even though Josue had known that the earth revolves he would have been forced to express by his *Sto Sol!* the effect which he wished to obtain, namely, the stopping of the earth in space and the prolongation of the day. At present and to the end of ages the positions of the earth in its orbit must be called *Solstices*." Again and again the distinction must be forced into notice. The Church knows that the God of Revelation cannot contradict the God of Nature, because both are one and the same God Who cannot stoop to falsehood. Therefore the Church is not afraid of scientific *truth*. But unproved theories are *not* scientific truth. If any proof be needed of this assertion, it may be found abundantly in the very unsatis-

factory condition of geological inquiry at the present moment. Theories which a few years since were enunciated with the greatest confidence as ascertained truths are now nearly abandoned. Sir Charles Lyell found reason to modify his views, and Mr. Herbert Spencer calmly says: "It cannot be concluded with any certainty that formations in which similar organic remains are found were of contemporaneous origin; nor can it be safely concluded that strata containing different organic remains are of different ages." There are few of us who do not know what a mighty superstructure has been raised upon those two conclusions which Mr. Herbert Spencer here calls uncertain and unsafe.

III.—NOTICES.

6. *Les Philosophes Convertis*, Etude de mœurs au XIXe. Siècle. Par M. Ch. de Bussy. Paris: Blériot Frères, 1879.

LIKE too many other semi-controversial writings, some dull, some lively, which tell of much earnest thought and offer many convincing arguments for the vindication of Catholic truth, this long, but well-sustained series of letters, starting from unbelief and ending in faith, is sure to be read by those the last whom it the most concerns. The two young friends who carry on the correspondence belong, before their conversion, to a class of silly boys who may have a few isolated imitators in England, but who as a class fortunately have no existence in our numerically small Catholic corporation. Young Catholics here as elsewhere very often yield to temptation, and fall away from the good lessons of home and school, and the "high thoughts of the sons of God;" but it is seldom indeed that they become sentimental philosophers. It is not the form which weakness takes on this side of the Straits. In France and Belgium the young men of Catholic families who think it a fine thing to ignore their Catholic education, and who pretend to despise the saying of prayers, form quite a large class. They would be worth converting, if not for the quality of their souls, at least for the quantity of them, but such a book as *Les Philosophes Convertis* they would not open, or touch, or go near, for fear—the dominating fear—of being laughed at by some poor little creatures of the same calibre as themselves. If the better specimens of the class, young men like these two letter-writers, who retain kind recollections of pious mothers, are to be converted, this may be by some such process as is here described, but not by reading the description of the process. To those, therefore, for whom the lessons which are conveyed in this epistolary form might be supposed to have been primarily intended, they will probably never find access. It remains that as an *Etude de mœurs au XIXe. siècle* the correspondence deserves to be read by those whom it neither principally nor immediately concerns.

7. *Le Procès de la Reine*. Par Raoul de Navery (Paris: Blériot Frères, 1879).—Marie de Brabant, the second wife of Philip the Bold, son of St. Louis, is accused by a foul slanderer, Pierre Labrosse, to the King, her husband, of having formed the design of poisoning a son of his previous marriage with Isabella of Aragon. She is condemned to be burned, and is saved at the last moment. The story in its arrangement of incidents seems to lie open to the same praise or blame, whichever it be considered, as another composition of the same author which we commended to the notice of our readers not long since—*Les Petits*. It is more fully adapted to the taste of French than of English readers. From our point of view the movements are too rapid, the changes too violent, and the retribution too theatrical. The prophecy of the holy woman in an early chapter lifts the veil of the future more than is usual in such utterances when they are granted in the actual order, and more than is perhaps altogether prudent in the world of fiction.

8. *Meditations and Contemplations on the Sacred Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ and on the Blessed Sacrament; with Instructions on Prayer*. Translated from the Spanish of the Venerable Luis of Granada, O.P., by a Member of the Order of Mercy (New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company, 1879).—It is enough to know the source from which these meditations and contemplations are taken to be sure that they are something more than merely pious thoughts arranged to help the memory in time of prayer. The Passion of our Lord, "the theme of themes," should be meditated under the guidance of a Saint who, having deeply felt the truth that "Jesus hath loved us," seeks in the simplest words to make others feel it also.

9. *The Workings of the Divine Will*. Gleanings from Père Causade, S.J. From the French (Burns and Oates).—A few eminently practical chapters of selected thoughts are offered in this little book to the consideration of persons who are too busy for intricate devices of piety, and too apt to imagine that the practice of higher perfection involves learned meditation and subtle analysis of the action of God in the soul. Spiritual direction and methodical observance are not equally within the reach of all, and are not equally necessary for all; and although as a general rule they are more needed now than formerly, they do not constitute an essential condition of holy living. To put ourselves into the hands of God, and to go bravely forward upon the path of duty which He sets before us, accepting from His hand, in holy simplicity, work to be done and sorrow to be borne, is to work out our sanctification, even if we have never had time to devote to the study of mystic theology, and do not know what asceticism means.

10. *St. Joseph's Manual of a Happy Eternity*. By Father Sebastian of the Blessed Sacrament, Priest of the Congregation of the Cross and Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ (Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, 1879).—A manual for the use of the members of the Confraternity of the Bona Mors, containing in small compass a series of reflections arranged

as a preparation for death, and the Mass and Office of the Dead, is offered to their acceptance by a Passionist Father, who appropriately dedicates his little book to the great patron and model of all who pray for a happy death or a happy eternity—St. Joseph.

11. *Jack's Boy*. By the Author of *Fluffy*, *Tom's Crucifix*, and other Tales (London: Washbourne, 1879).—A little boy, the child of an Irish father, who is reclaimed on his death-bed, and an English mother, who, being unable to support him, consigns him to the care of a dreadful Protestant grandmother, is fortunately lost in the street before the old woman, in her desire to win the favour of the "districk ladies," has had him proselytized. After various adventures he is adopted by a poor Irishwoman with a large family of her own, and dies in his first fervour of attending at catechism, being the happy instrument of the conversion of a poor girl who had been kind to him in his dereliction. The opening words of the Catechism, spoken with childish earnestness and ratified by the death of an innocent, could not be resisted. The more we have of such tales to move kind hearts, the better will it be for the children of the poor in our overgrown towns.

12. *The Countess de Bonneval: Her Life and Letters*. By Lady Georgiana Fullerton. Copyright Edition (London: Burns and Oates, 1880).—It will not be necessary to recommend to Catholic readers any work of Lady Georgiana Fullerton's, but we call attention to this new edition, which is wonderfully cheap. *Mrs. Gerald's Niece* and *A Stormy Life* have also appeared in this form.

13. We must find space for a word of thanks to Signor Romano, of Turin, for his beautiful little "totum"—a *Roman Breviary* for the whole year which is not so large as many editions of the *Horæ Diurnæ*. The parts of the Breviary which are always in use are printed in a small volume, which is so bound up as to admit of the constant addition of those out of a number of very thin little supplements which are required for the particular seasons and saints' days in succession. We must also mention as a great gain to Catholic children some little *Meditations for the Young* (Burns and Oates). We have also to notice, far more rapidly than it deserves, the last of Father Gallwey's *Twelve Lectures on Ritualism* (Burns and Oates); and a translation of the well-known *Calendrier de St. Ignace*, in which a leaf is given to every day of the year, containing some practical maxim of the Saint. It has been translated by Miss André, and is called *The Spirit of St. Ignatius*. The nice little tales, *The Stoneleighs of Stoneleigh*, by the author of *Tyborne*, and the *Fifth of November*, by the author of *Marian Howard* (Burns and Oates), have, we think, already appeared in another form.

ST. JOSEPH'S
CATHOLIC LENDING LIBRARY,

48, South Street, Grosvenor Square.

OPEN DAILY FROM HALF-PAST TEN TO FIVE O'CLOCK.

NEW BOOKS FOR JANUARY.

- The Anglican Ministry.* By A. W. Hutton.
Metaphysics of the Schools. By Father Harper.
Training of the Apostles. Vol. I. By Father Coleridge.
Sunshine and Shadow. By Mrs. Brassy.
Procès de la Reine. By Raoul de Navery.
Les Philosophes Convertis. By Charles Bussy.
Through Rough Waters.
Bernadette. Par Henri Lasserre.
Per Crucem ad Lucem. By T. W. Allies.
Une Femme Apôtre.
Remarks on Moral Training. Edited by Father Gallwey.
A History of our own Times. By Justin M'Carthy, M.P.
Life of St. Thomas of Hereford. By Father Strange.
The Catholic Church and the Kaffir.
St. Thomas on the Adorable Sacrament of the Altar. Edited by Father Rawes.
The Manna of the Soul. By Father Segneri (Fourth Volume).
The Shemitic Origin of the Nations of Western Europe.
Other Gospels. By Father Humphrey.
The Scientific Value of Tradition.
Jack's Boy. By F. M. S.
A Victim of the Falk Laws.
The Mission of the Zambesi. By Father Weld, S.J.
Life of Mary Aikenhead.
Essays on Devotional and Scriptural Subjects. By W. G. Ward.
Sketches of the Life of Mgr. Mazenod. Vol. I.
The Credentials of the Catholic Church. By Rev. J. B. Bagshawe.
The Jesuits, their Foundation and History. Vol. II.
Legends of the Saxon Saints. By Aubrey de Vere.
Pietas Mariana Britannica. By E. Waterton.
History of the Society of Jesus. By B. N.
A Gracious Life (Mme. Acarie). By E. Bowles.
Réminiscences. Par Mme. Craven.
The Life of Bishop Fisher.
Cambria Sacra.
Wiesener's Jeunesse d'Elisabeth d'Angleterre.
Poems of the late R. S. Hawker.
Life of Sr. M. Frances of the Five Wounds.
The Manna of the Soul. By Father Segneri. (Third Volume).
Three Catholic Reformers. By M. H. Allies.
The Sermon on the Mount. By Father Coleridge.
Life of Father Benvenuto Bambozzi.

GRATEFUL.—COMFORTING.

EPPS'S (BREAKFAST) COCOA.

"By a thorough knowledge of the natural laws which govern the operations of digestion and nutrition, and by a careful application of the fine properties of well-selected Cocoa, Mr. Epps has provided our breakfast tables with a delicately-flavoured beverage which may save us many heavy doctors' bills. It is by the judicious use of such articles of diet that a constitution may be gradually built up until strong enough to resist every tendency to disease. Hundreds of subtle maladies are floating around us ready to attack wherever there is a weak point. We may escape many a fatal shaft by keeping ourselves well fortified with pure blood and a properly nourished frame."—*The Civil Service Gazette*.

"MANUFACTURE OF COCOA.—We will now give an account of the process adopted by Messrs. James Epps and Co., manufacturers of dietetic articles, at their works in the Euston Road, London."—See Article in *Cassell's Household Guide*.

MADE SIMPLY WITH BOILING WATER OR MILK.

SOLD ONLY IN PACKETS, LABELLED.

JAMES EPPS & CO., Homœopathic Chemists,
LONDON.

Makers of EPPS'S GLYCERINE JUJUBES.

